arXiv:0906.1310v1 [math.ST] 6 Jun 2009

Submitted to the Annals of Statistics

BOOTSTRAP CONSISTENCY FOR GENERAL SEMIPARAMETRIC M-ESTIMATION

June 6, 2009

By Guang Cheng* and Jianhua Z. Huang†

Purdue University and Texas A&M University

Consider M-estimation in a semiparametric model that is characterized by a Euclidean parameter of interest and a nuisance function parameter. We show that, under general conditions, the bootstrap is asymptotically consistent in estimating the distribution of the M-estimate of Euclidean parameter; that is, the bootstrap distribution asymptotically imitates the distribution of the M-estimate. We also show that the bootstrap confidence set has the asymptotically correct coverage probability. These general conclusions hold, in particular, when the nuisance parameter is not estimable at root-n rate. Our results provide a theoretical justification for the use of bootstrap as an inference tool in semiparametric modelling and apply to a broad class of bootstrap methods with exchangeable bootstrap weights. A by-product of our theoretical development is the second order asymptotic linear expansion of the (bootstrap) M-estimate.

1. Introdution.

Due to its flexibility, semiparametric modelling has provided a powerful statistical modelling framework for complex data, and proven to be useful in a variety of contexts, see [1, 5, 17, 25, 26, 30, 41, 42].

---

*Guang Cheng is Assistant Professor, Department of Statistics, Purdue University

†Jianhua Z. Huang is Professor, Department of Statistics, Texas A&M University

AMS 2000 subject classifications: Primary 62F40; Secondary 62G20

Keywords and phrases: Bootstrap Consistency, Bootstrap Confidence Set, Semiparametric Model, M-estimation, Second Order Accuracy

Semiparametric models are indexed by a Euclidean parameter of interest $\theta \in \Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and a nuisance function parameter η belonging to a Banach space $\mathcal{H}$ with norm $\|\cdot\|$. M-estimation, including the maximum likelihood estimation as a special case, refers to a general method of estimation, where the estimates are obtained by optimizing certain criterion functions [8, 15, 23, 38]. The asymptotic theories and inference procedures for semiparametric maximum likelihood estimation, or more generally M-estimation, have been extensively studied in [2, 26, 27, 28, 34, 36]. In particular, a general theorem for investigating the asymptotic behavior of M-estimate for θ in semiparametric models is given in [38, 39].

The bootstrap method is a widely used data-resampling method in drawing statistical inference such as obtainig standard errors and constructing confidence regions. See [3, 14, 18, 22, 23, 24, 33] for its application in semiparametric models. By replacing complicated theoretical derivations with the routine simulation of bootstrap samples, the bootstrap method is conceptually and operationally simple. It is such simplicity that leads to the popularity of the bootstrap method. However, the validity of the bootstrap, i.e., why it yields the valid inference, needs to be theoretically justified. While the asymptotic validity of the bootstrap method has been well established in parametric models [13, 32], a systematic theoretical study on the bootstrap inference in semiparametric models is almost non-existence, especially when the nuisance function η is not $\sqrt{n}$ convergent. This paper tries to fill in this gap.

An unfortunate observation is that even the basic bootstrap consistency theorem has never been established for semiparametric models. The lack of theoretical justifications of the bootstrap in the semiparametric context leads to the development of other semiparametric inferential tools, e.g., piggyback bootstrap [9] and profile sampler [21]. Although having established asymptotic theory, these alternatives of the bootstrap have their own shortcomings. The piggyback bootstrap is not the standard bootstrap and requires knowing the limiting distribution of MLE for θ, which may not be easy to estimate in general. The implementation of profile sampler involves the computation of the profile likelihood and may have some MCMC computational issues, e.g. the choice of prior and the convergence of the Markov chain. Moreover, neither of these methods is as simple to implement as the classical bootstrap of Efron. The purpose of this paper is to develop a general theory on bootstrap consistency for the classical bootstrap method and thus promote its use as an inference tool for semiparametric models. We focus on the Euclidean parameter of the model. Our main results are summarized below.

The semiparametric M-estimator $(\widehat{\theta}, \widehat{\eta})$ and bootstrap M-estimator $(\widehat{\theta}^*, \widehat{\eta}^*)$ are obtained by optimizing the objective function $m(\theta, \eta)$ based on the i.i.d. observations $(X_1, \ldots, X_n)$ and bootstrap sample $(X_1^*, \ldots, X_n^*)$, respectively:

$$(\widehat{\theta}, \widehat{\eta}) = \arg \sup_{\theta \in \Theta, \eta \in \mathcal{H}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} m(\theta, \eta)(X_i), \tag{1}$$

$$(\widehat{\theta}^*, \widehat{\eta}^*) = \arg \sup_{\theta \in \Theta, \eta \in \mathcal{H}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} m(\theta, \eta)(X_i^*). \tag{2}$$

Note that we can also express

$$(\widehat{\theta}^*, \widehat{\eta}^*) = \arg \sup_{\theta \in \Theta, \eta \in \mathcal{H}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} W_{ni} m(\theta, \eta)(X_i). \tag{3}$$

by using the bootstrap weights W_{ni}'s. For example, if $(X_1^*, \ldots, X_n^*)$ are independent draws with replacement from the original sample, i.e. *Efron's*

(Nonparametric) Bootstrap, then $W_n \equiv (W_{n1}, \ldots, W_{nn})$ follows the Multinomial distribution with parameter $(n, (n^{-1}, \ldots, n^{-1}))$. The more general *exchangeable bootstrap weighting scheme* [29] that includes Efron's bootstrap as a special case are considered in this paper.

We first present a preliminary result showing the asymptotic normality of semiparametric M-estimate $\widehat{\theta}$ in Theorem 1. As a *key* result in this paper, our Theorem 2 confirms that this limiting distribution can be bootstrapped consistently. For example, in the Efron's bootstrap, the bootstrap distribution of $\sqrt{n}(\widehat{\theta}^* - \widehat{\theta})$, conditional on the observed data, asymptotically imitates the distribution of $\sqrt{n}(\widehat{\theta} - \theta_0)$, where θ_0 is the true value of θ, see Corollary 1. As shown in Theorem 3, the consistency of the bootstrap confidence set of θ, which means that its coverage probability converges to the nominal level, immediately follows from the above distributional consistency theorem. All the above conclusions are valid, in particular, when the nuisance parameter has slower than root-n convergence rate. The rigorous proof of Theorem 2 is very challenging since it requires careful probabilistic analysis, see Lemma A.1, and involves the bootstrapped empirical processes techniques.

As a by-product of our theoretical development, we also obtain the second order asymptotic linear expansions for the M-estimator of the Euclidean parameter and for its bootstrap version, which imply that the second order accuracy of the (bootstrap) M-estimate depends on the convergence rate of the nuisance function parameter. Such results extend similar results of Cheng and Kosorok [6, 7] for MLE and are of its own interests.

In a highly related paper, Ma and Kosorok (2005) obtained some consistency results for what they called the weighted bootstrap where the bootstrap weights $\{W_{ni}\}_{i=1}^n$ are assumed to be independent. This independence assumption rules out the possiblity of applying their results to justify Efron's boostrap in the semiparametric setting. They stated in the paper that the independence assumption makes the proofs easier and the relaxation to the dependent weights appears to be *quite difficult*. In this paper, we make use of the bootstrapped empirical processes techniques [12] to overcome the technical difficulties. Other related work includes interesting results on bootstrap consistency in nonparametric models. Wellner and Zhan (1996) proved the bootstrap consistency for root-n convergent nonparametric estimates obtained by solving estimation equations. Sen et. al. (2009) and Kosorok (2008) showed the inconsistency of bootstrapping Grenander estimator.

Our main results, including the bootstrap consistency theorem, are presented in Section 2. Sections 3 and 4 discuss how to verify various technical conditions needed for the main results. Section 5 illustrates the applications of our main results using three examples. Sections 6 contains proofs of our main results in Section 2. Some useful lemmas and additional proofs are postponed to Appendix.

2. Main Results.

2.1. *Preliminaries.* We first introduce a paradigm for studying the semiparametric M-estimate $\widehat{\theta}$, which parallels the efficient influence function paradigm used for MLEs (where $m(\theta,\eta)=\log lik(\theta,\eta)$), developed in Section 6 of [38]. Let

$$m_1(\theta,\eta)=\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta}m(\theta,\eta)\quad\text{ and }\quad m_2(\theta,\eta)[h]=\frac{\partial}{\partial t}|_{t=0}m(\theta,\eta(t)),$$

where h is a "direction" along which $\eta(t) \in \mathcal{H}$ approaches η as $t \to 0$, running through some index set $\mathbf{H} \subseteq L_2^0(P_{\theta,\eta})$. Similarly we also define

$$m_{11}(\theta,\eta) = \frac{\partial}{\partial\theta} m_1(\theta,\eta) \quad \text{and} \quad m_{12}(\theta,\eta)[h] = \frac{\partial}{\partial t}|_{t=0} m_1(\theta,\eta(t)),$$
$$m_{21}(\theta,\eta)[h] = \frac{\partial}{\partial\theta} m_2(\theta,\eta)[h] \quad \text{and} \quad m_{22}(\theta,\eta)[h,g] = \frac{\partial}{\partial t}|_{t=0} m_2(\theta,\eta_2(t))[h],$$

where $h, g \in \mathbf{H}$ and $(\partial/\partial t)|_{t=0}\eta_2(t) = g$. Define

$$\begin{aligned} m_2(\theta,\eta)[H] &= (m_2(\theta,\eta)[h_1],\ldots,m_2(\theta,\eta)[h_d])' \\ m_{22}[H,h] &= (m_{22}(\theta,\eta)[h_1,h],\ldots,m_{22}(\theta,\eta)[h_d,h])', \end{aligned}$$

where $H = (h_1,\ldots,h_d)$ and $h_j \in \mathbf{H}$ for $j = 1,\ldots,d$. Assume there exists an

$$H^\dagger(\theta,\eta) = (h_1^\dagger(\theta,\eta),\ldots,h_d^\dagger(\theta,\eta))',$$

where each $h_j^\dagger(\theta,\eta) \in \mathbf{H}$, such that for any $h \in \mathbf{H}$

$$E_{\theta,\eta}\left\{m_{12}(\theta,\eta)[h] - m_{22}(\theta,\eta)[H^\dagger,h]\right\} = 0. \tag{4}$$

Following the idea of the *efficient score function*, we define the function

$$\widetilde{m}(\theta,\eta) = m_1(\theta,\eta) - m_2(\theta,\eta)[H^\dagger(\theta,\eta)].$$

Based on the constructions of $m_1(\theta,\eta)$ and $m_2(\theta,\eta)[H]$, $(\widehat{\theta},\widehat{\eta})$ satisfies

$$\mathbb{P}_n \widetilde{m}(\widehat{\theta},\widehat{\eta}) = 0, \tag{5}$$

where $\mathbb{P}_n f$ denotes $\sum_{i=1}^n f(X_i)/n$. We assume that the observed data are from the probability space $(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{A},P_X)$, and that

$$P_X \widetilde{m}(\theta_0,\eta_0) = 0, \tag{6}$$

where $P_X f$ is the customary operator notation defined as $\int f dP_X$. The assumption (6) is common in semiparametric M-estimation [23, 38] and usually holds by the semiparametric model specifications, e.g. the semiparametric regression models with "panel count data" [38]. In particular, when $m(\theta, \eta) = \log lik(\theta, \eta)$, (6) trivially holds and $\widetilde{m}(\theta, \eta)$ becomes the well studied *efficient score function* for θ in semiparametric models, see [2].

Throughout the rest of the paper, we use the shortened notations $H_0^\dagger = H^\dagger(\theta_0, \eta_0)$, $\widetilde{m}_0 = \widetilde{m}(\theta_0, \eta_0)$ and $\widehat{m} = \widetilde{m}(\widehat{\theta}, \widehat{\eta})$, and we use the superscript "o" to denote the outer probability. For a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, P)$ and a map $T : \Omega \mapsto \bar{\mathbb{R}}$ that need not be measurable, the notations $E^o T$, $O_{P_X}^o(1)$, and $o_{P_X}^o(1)$ represent the outer expectation of T w.r.t. P, bounded and converges to zero in outer probability, respectively. More precise definitions can be found on Page 6 of [34]. Let $V^{\otimes 2}$ represent the outer product matrix VV' for any vector V. Define $x \vee y$ ($x \wedge y$) to be the maximum (minimum) value of x and y.

We now state some general conditions that will be used throughout the whole paper. We assume that the true value θ_0 of the Euclidean parameter is an interior point of the compact set Θ.

I. *Postive Information Condition: The matrices* $A = P_X(m_{11}(\theta_0, \eta_0) - m_{21}(\theta_0, \eta_0)[H_0^\dagger])$ *and* $B = P_X[\{m_1(\theta_0, \eta_0) - m_2(\theta_0, \eta_0)[H_0^\dagger]\}^{\otimes 2}]$ *are both nonsingular.*

Condition I above is used to ensure the nonsingularity of the asymptotic variance of $\widehat{\theta}$ in (14), which will be shown to be $A^{-1}B(A^{-1})'$.

For the empirical process $\mathbb{G}_n = \sqrt{n}(\mathbb{P}_n - P_X)$, denote its norm with respect to a function class $\mathcal{F}_n$ as $\|\mathbb{G}_n\|_{\mathcal{F}_n} = \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_n} |\mathbb{G}_n f|$. For any fixed $\delta_n > 0$, define a class of functions $\mathcal{S}_n$ as

$$\mathcal{S}_n \equiv \mathcal{S}_n(\delta_n) = \left\{ \frac{\widetilde{m}(\theta_0, \eta) - \widetilde{m}(\theta_0, \eta_0)}{\|\eta - \eta_0\|} : \|\eta - \eta_0\| \leq \delta_n \right\}, \tag{7}$$

and a shrinking neighborhood of (θ_0, η_0) as

$$\mathcal{C}_n \equiv \mathcal{C}_n(\delta_n) = \{(\theta, \eta) : \|\theta - \theta_0\| \leq \delta_n, \|\eta - \eta_0\| \leq \delta_n\}. \tag{8}$$

The next two conditions, Conditions S1–S2, make sure that the empirical processes indexed by $\widetilde{m}(\theta, \eta)$ are well behaved and $\widetilde{m}(\theta, \eta)$ is smooth enough around (θ_0, η_0).

S1. *Stochastic Equicontinuity Condition: for any* $\delta_n \to 0$,

$$\|\mathbb{G}_n\|_{\mathcal{S}_n} = O^o_{P_X}(1) \tag{9}$$

and

$$\mathbb{G}_n(\widetilde{m}(\theta, \eta) - \widetilde{m}(\theta_0, \eta)) = O^o_{P_X}(\|\theta - \theta_0\|) \quad \text{for} \quad (\theta, \eta) \in \mathcal{C}_n. \tag{10}$$

S2. *Smoothness Condition:*

$$P_X(\widetilde{m}(\theta, \eta) - \widetilde{m}_0) = A(\theta - \theta_0) + O(\|\theta - \theta_0\|^2 \vee \|\eta - \eta_0\|^2), \tag{11}$$

for (θ, η) *in some neighborhood of* (θ_0, η_0).

For any fixed θ, define

$$\widehat{\eta}_\theta = \arg\sup_{\eta \in \mathcal{H}} \mathbb{P}_n m(\theta, \eta).$$

The next condition says that $\widehat{\eta}_\theta$ should be close to η_0 if θ is close to θ_0.

S3. *Convergence Rate Condition: there exists a* $\gamma \in (1/4, 1/2]$ *such that,*

$$\|\widehat{\eta}_{\widetilde{\theta}} - \eta_0\| = O^o_{P_X}(\|\widetilde{\theta} - \theta_0\| \vee n^{-\gamma}), \tag{12}$$

for any consistent $\widetilde{\theta}$.

Here γ is required to be larger than $1/4$, which is always true for regular semiparametric models (see Section 3.4 of [34]).

Verifications of Conditions S1–S3 will be discussed in Sections 3 and 4 and illustrated with examples in Section 5.

2.2. *Semiparametric M-estimator.* We show that the semiparametric M-estimator $\widehat{\theta}$ has an asymptotic linear expression and it is asymptotically normally distributed. This result plays an important role in proving bootstrap consistency in the next subsection.

THEOREM 1. *Suppose that Conditions I, S1-S3 hold and that* $(\widehat{\theta},\widehat{\eta})$ *satisfies (5). If* $\widehat{\theta}$ *is consistent, then*

$$\sqrt{n}(\widehat{\theta}-\theta_0)=-\sqrt{n}A^{-1}\mathbb{P}_n\widetilde{m}_0+O^o_{P_X}(n^{-2\gamma+1/2}). \tag{13}$$

Thus, we have

$$\sqrt{n}(\widehat{\theta}-\theta_0)\xrightarrow{d}N(0,\Sigma), \tag{14}$$

where $\Sigma\equiv A^{-1}B(A^{-1})'$, *$A$ and B are given in Condition I.*

We assume consistency of $\widehat{\theta}$ in Theorem 1. The consistency can be usually guaranteed under the following "well-separated" condition:

$$P_Xm(\theta_0,\eta_0)>\sup_{(\theta,\eta)\notin G}P_Xm(\theta,\eta) \tag{15}$$

for any open set $G\subset\Theta\times\mathcal{H}$ containing (θ_0,η_0), see Theorem 5.7 in [35].

To obtain the asymptotic normality, we only need the remainder term in the asymtotic linear expansion (13) to be of order $o^o_{P_X}(1)$. Since $\gamma>1/4$, the order of the remainder term $O^o_{P_X}(n^{-2\gamma+1/2})$ is always $o^o_{P_X}(1)$. We actually obtain a higher order expansion, stronger than what is needed for showing asymptotic normality. It is interesting to note that the rate of convergence of the remainder term depends on how accurately the nuisance function parameter η can be estimated. In other words, we can conclude that the second order estimation accuracy of $\widehat{\theta}$ is higher for semiparametric models with faster convergent η. This higher order result extends a similar result of Cheng and Kosorok [6, 7] developed for maximum likelihood to the M-estimation setting.

For maximum likelihood estimation, $m(\theta,\eta)=\log lik(\theta,\eta)$, and it is easy to see that $A=-B$ and $\Sigma=B^{-1}$. In this case, Σ^{-1} becomes the *efficient information matrix*.

Remark 1. *Given any consistent estimator $\widehat{\Sigma}$ of Σ, we have*

$$\sqrt{n}\widehat{\Sigma}^{-1/2}(\widehat{\theta}-\theta_0)\xrightarrow{d}N(0,I) \tag{16}$$

by Theorem 1 and Slutsky's Theorem. In practice, the consistent $\widehat{\Sigma}$ can be obtained via either the observed profile information approach [27] or the profile sampler approach [21].

Remark 2. *The M-estimation equation (5) can be relaxed to the "nearly maximizing" condition $\mathbb{P}_n\widetilde{m}(\widehat{\theta},\widehat{\eta})=o^o_{P_X}(n^{-1/2})$. Under weaker conditions than stated in Theorem 1, the same argument can be used to show*

$$\sqrt{n}(\widehat{\theta}-\theta_0)=-\sqrt{n}A^{-1}\mathbb{P}_n\widetilde{m}_0+o^o_{P_X}(1), \tag{17}$$

which also implies the asymptotic normality of $\widehat{\theta}$, i.e. (14) and (16). Note that (17) has also been established in [23, 38], but our argument can be used to obtain the higher order expansion result (13).

2.3. *Bootstrap Consistency.* In this subsection, we establish the consistency of bootstrapping θ under general condtions in the framework of semiparametric M-estimation. Define $\mathbb{P}_n^* f = (1/n)\sum_{i=1}^n W_{ni} f(X_i)$, where W_{ni}'s are the bootstrap weights defined on the probability space $(\mathcal{W}, \Omega, P_W)$. In view of (3), the bootstrap estimator can be rewritten as

$$(\widehat{\theta}^*, \widehat{\eta}^*) = \arg \sup_{\theta\in\Theta, \eta\in\mathcal{H}} \mathbb{P}_n^* m(\theta, \eta).$$

Similar to (5), we can show that $(\widehat{\theta}^*, \widehat{\eta}^*)$ satisfies

$$\mathbb{P}_n^* \widetilde{m}(\widehat{\theta}^*, \widehat{\eta}^*) = 0. \tag{18}$$

The bootstrap weights W_{ni}'s are assumed to belong to the class of exchangeable bootstrap weights introduced in [29]. Specifically, they satisfy the following conditions:

- W1. *The vector* $W_n = (W_{n1}, \ldots, W_{nn})'$ *is exchangeable for all* $n = 1, 2, \ldots,$ *i.e. for any permutation* $\pi = (\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_n)$ *of* $(1, 2, \ldots, n)$*, the joint distribution of* $\pi(W_n) = (W_{n\pi_1}, \ldots, W_{n\pi_n})'$ *is the same as that of* W_n.
- W2. $W_{ni} \geq 0$ *for all* n*,* i *and* $\sum_{i=1}^n W_{ni}$ *for all* n.
- W3. $\limsup_{n\to\infty} \|W_{n1}\|_{2,1} \leq C < \infty$*, where* $\|W_{n1}\|_{2,1} = \int_0^\infty \sqrt{P_W(W_{n1} \geq u)}du$.
- W4. $\lim_{\lambda\to\infty} \limsup_{n\to\infty} \sup_{t\geq\lambda} t^2 P_W(W_{n1} > t) = 0$.
- W5. $(1/n)\sum_{i=1}^n (W_{ni} - 1)^2 \xrightarrow{P_W} c^2 > 0$.

In Efron's nonparametric bootstrap, the bootstrap sample is drawn from the nonparametric estimate of the true distribution, i.e. empirical distribution. Thus, it is easy to show that $W_n \sim \text{Multinomial}(n, (n^{-1}, \ldots, n^{-1}))$ and Conditions W1–W5 are satisfied with $c = 1$ in W5. In general, Conditions W3-W5 are easily satisfied under some moment conditions on W_{ni}, see

Lemma 3.1 of [29]. In addition to Efron's nonparametric boostrap, the sampling schemes that satisfy Conditions W1–W5 include *Bayesian bootstrap, Multiplier bootstrap, Double bootstrap, and Urn boostrap*; see [29].

There exist two sources of randomness for the bootstrapped quantity, e.g. $\widehat{\theta}^*$: one comes from the observed data; another comes from the resampling done by the bootstrap, i.e. random W_{ni}'s. Therefore, in order to rigorously state our theoretical results for the bootstrap, we need to specify relevant probability spaces and define stochastic orders with respect to relevant probability measures.

We view X_i as the ith coordinate projection from the canonical probability space $(\mathcal{X}^\infty, \mathcal{A}^\infty, P_X^\infty)$ onto the ith copy of $\mathcal{X}$. For the joint randomness involved, the product probability space is defined as

$$(\mathcal{X}^\infty, \mathcal{A}^\infty, P_X^\infty) \times (\mathcal{W}, \Omega, P_W) = (\mathcal{X}^\infty \times \mathcal{W}, \mathcal{A}^\infty \times \Omega, P_{XW}).$$

In this paper, we assume that the bootstrap weights W_{ni}'s are independent of the data X_i's, thus $P_{XW} = P_X^\infty \times P_W$. We write P_X^∞ as P_X for simplicity thereafter. Define E_{XW}^o as the outer expectation w.r.t. P_{XW}. The notations $E_{X|W}^o$, E_X^o and E_W are defined similarly.

Given a real-valued function Δ_n defined on the above product probability space, e.g. $\widehat{\theta}^*$, we say that Δ_n is of an order $o_{P_W}^o(1)$ in P_X^o-probability if for any $\epsilon, \eta > 0$,

$$P_X^o\{P_{W|X}^o(|\Delta_n| > \epsilon) > \eta\} \quad \longrightarrow \quad 0 \tag{19}$$

as $n \to 0$, and that Δ_n is of an order $O_{P_W}^o(1)$ in P_X^o-probability if for any $\eta > 0$, there exists a $0 < M < \infty$ such that

$$P_X^o\{P_{W|X}^o(|\Delta_n| \geq M) > \eta\} \longrightarrow 0 \tag{20}$$

as $n \to \infty$.

Given a function Γ_n defined only on $(\mathcal{X}^\infty, \mathcal{A}^\infty, P_X^\infty)$, if it is of an order $o_{P_X}^o(1)$ $(O_{P_X}^o(1))$, then it is also of an order $o_{P_{XW}}^o(1)$ $(O_{P_{XW}}^o(1))$ based on the following argument:

$$\begin{aligned} P_{XW}^o(|\Gamma_n| > \epsilon) &= E_{XW}^o 1\{|\Gamma_n| > \epsilon\} = E_X E_{W|X} 1\{|\Gamma_n| > \epsilon\}^o \\ &= E_X 1\{|\Gamma_n| > \epsilon\}^o = P_X^o\{|\Gamma_n| > \epsilon\}, \end{aligned}$$

where the third equation holds since Γ_n does not depend on the bootstrap weight. More results on transition of various stochastic orders are given in Lemma A.1 of the Appendix. Such results are used repeatedly in proving our bootstrap consistency theorem.

To establish the bootstrap consistency, we need some additional conditions. The first condition is the measurability condition, denoted as $M(P_X)$. We say a class of functions $\mathcal{F} \in M(P_X)$ if $\mathcal{F}$ possesses enough measurability so that $\mathbb{P}_n$ can be randomized, i.e. we can replace $(\delta_{X_i} - P_X)$ by $(W_{ni} - 1)\delta_{X_i}$, and Fubini's Theorem can be used freely. The detailed description for $M(P_X)$ is spelled out in [12] and also given in the Appendix of this paper. Define $\mathcal{T} = \{\widetilde{m}(\theta, \eta) : \|\theta - \theta_0\| + \|\eta - \eta_0\| \leq R\}$ for some $R > 0$. For the rest of the paper we assume $\mathcal{T} \in M(P_X)$.

The second class of conditions parallels Conditions S1-S3 used for obtaining asymptotic normality of M-estimators and is only slightly stronger. Thus, the bootstrap consistency for the Euclidean parameter in semiparametric models is almost automatically guaranteed once the semiparametric M-estimate is shown to be asymptotically normal. Let $S_n(x)$ be the envelop function of the class $\mathcal{S}_n = \mathcal{S}_n(\delta_n)$ defined in (7), i.e.

$$S_n(x) = \sup_{\|\eta-\eta_0\|\leq\delta_n} \left| \frac{\widetilde{m}(\theta_0,\eta) - \widetilde{m}_0}{\|\eta-\eta_0\|} \right|.$$

The next condition controls the tail of this envelop function.

SB1. *Tail Probability Condition:*

$$\lim_{\lambda\to\infty} \lim \sup_{n\to\infty} \sup_{t\geq\lambda} t^2 P_X^o(S_n(X_1) > t) = 0 \tag{21}$$

for any sequence $\delta_n \to 0$.

Let $\dot{\mathcal{T}} = \{\partial\widetilde{m}(\theta,\eta)/\partial\theta : (\theta,\eta) \in \mathcal{C}_n\}$, where $\mathcal{C}_n = \mathcal{C}_n(\delta_n)$ is defined in (8).

SB2. *We assume that* $\dot{\mathcal{T}} \in M(P_X) \cap L_2(P_X)$ *and that* $\dot{\mathcal{T}}$ *is P-Donsker.*

Condition SB2 ensures that the size of the function class $\dot{\mathcal{T}}$ is reasonable so that the bootstrapped empirical processes $\mathbb{G}_n^* \equiv \sqrt{n}(\mathbb{P}_n^* - \mathbb{P}_n)$ indexed by $\dot{\mathcal{T}}$ has a limiting process conditional on the observations; see Theorem 2.2 in [29].

For any fixed θ, define

$$\widehat{\eta}_\theta^* = \arg\max_{\eta\in\mathcal{H}} \mathbb{P}_n^* m(\theta,\eta).$$

The next condition says that $\widehat{\eta}_\theta^*$ should be close to η_0 if θ is close to θ_0.

SB3. *Bootstrap Convergence Rate Condition: there exists a* $\gamma \in (1/4, 1/2]$ *such that*

$$\|\widehat{\eta}_{\widetilde{\theta}}^* - \eta_0\| = O_{P_W}^o(\|\widetilde{\theta} - \theta_0\| \vee n^{-\gamma}) \ \text{ in } P_X^o - \text{probability} \tag{22}$$

for any $\widetilde{\theta} \xrightarrow{P_{XW}^o} \theta_0$.

Verifications of Conditions SB1–SB2 will be discussed in Section 3. Two general Theorems are given in Section 4 to aid verification of Condition SB3.

To rigorously state the bootstrap consistency result, we need the notion of *conditional weak convergence* [16]. Let $BL_1(\mathbb{B})$ be a collection of Lipschitz continuous functions $h : \mathbb{B} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ bounded in absolute value by 1 and having Lipschitz constant 1, i.e. $|h(x)| \leq 1$ and $|h(x) - h(y)| \leq \|x - y\|$ for all $x, y \in \mathbb{B}$. We say $\widehat{X}_n^*$ converges weakly to X conditional on the data $\mathcal{X}_n$, denoted as $\widehat{X}_n^* \Longrightarrow X$, if

$$\sup_{h \in BL_1(\mathbb{B})} |E_{\cdot|\mathcal{X}_n} h(\widehat{X}_n^*) - E_X h(X)| = o_{P_X}^o(1), \tag{23}$$

where $E_{\cdot|\mathcal{X}_n}$ denotes the conditional expectation given the data $\mathcal{X}_n$, provided $h(\widehat{X}_n^*)$ is asymptotically measurable unconditionally for all $h \in BL_1(\mathbb{B})$. More discussions of conditional weak convergence can be found in [34].

The next result is a bootstrap version of Theorem 1.

THEOREM 2. *Suppose that $\widehat{\theta}$ and $\widehat{\theta}^*$ satisfy (5) and (18), respectively. Also assume that $\widehat{\theta} \xrightarrow{P_X} \theta_0$ and $\widehat{\theta}^* \xrightarrow{P_{XW}^o} \theta_0$. Assume that Conditions I, S1-S3, SB1-SB3 and W1-W5 hold. We have that*

$$\|\widehat{\theta}^* - \theta_0\| = O_{P_W}^o(n^{-1/2}) \tag{24}$$

in P_X^o-Probability. Furthermore,

$$\sqrt{n}(\widehat{\theta}^* - \widehat{\theta}) = -A^{-1}\mathbb{G}_n^* \widetilde{m}_0 + O_{P_W}^o(n^{1/2-2\gamma}) \tag{25}$$

in P_X^o-probability. Thus,

$$(\sqrt{n}/c)(\widehat{\theta}^* - \widehat{\theta}) \Longrightarrow N(0, \Sigma), \tag{26}$$

where c is given in W5, whose value depends on the used sampling scheme, and $\Sigma \equiv A^{-1}B(A^{-1})'$ with A and B given in Condition I.

The assumption $\widehat{\theta}^* \overset{P^o_{XW}}{\longrightarrow} \theta_0$ can be established by adapting the Argmax Theorem, Corollary 3.2.3, in [34]. Briefly, we need two conditions for accomplishing this. The first one is the "well separated" condition (15). Another one is

$$\sup_{(\theta,\eta)\in\Theta\times\mathcal{H}} |\mathbb{P}^*_n m(\theta,\eta) - P_X m(\theta,\eta)| \overset{P^o_{XW}}{\longrightarrow} 0. \tag{27}$$

By the Multiplier Glivenko-Cantelli Theorem, i.e. Lemma 3.6.16 in [34], and (A.1) in the Appendix, we know that (27) holds if $\{m(\theta,\eta) : \theta \in \Theta, \eta \in \mathcal{H}\}$ is shown to be P-Donsker.

Note that (25) and (26) of Theorem 2 are in parallel to (13) and (14) of Theorem 1. In particular, the asymptotic linear expansion (25) is a second order one in the sense that the remainder term is of more refined order than $o^o_{P_W}(1)$ whose rate of convergence depends on how accurately the nuisance function η can be estimated. Thus, it might be reasonable to conjecture that more accurate bootstrap inferences can be drawn from the semiparametric models with faster convergent η.

Let $P_{W|\mathcal{X}_n}$ denote the conditional distribution given the observed data $\mathcal{X}_n$. Note that Theorem 2 implies that

$$\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^d} \left| P_{W|\mathcal{X}_n}((\sqrt{n}/c)(\widehat{\theta}^* - \widehat{\theta}) \le x) - P(N(0,\Sigma) \le x) \right| = o^o_{P_X}(1) \tag{28}$$

by setting $h(\cdot) = 1\{\cdot \le x\}$, where " $\le$ " is taken componentwise, in (23). Theorem 1 together with Lemma 2.11 in [35] implies that

$$\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^d} \left| P_X(\sqrt{n}(\widehat{\theta} - \theta_0) \le x) - P(N(0,\Sigma) \le x) \right| = o(1). \tag{29}$$

Combining (28) and (29), we obtain the following bootstrap consistency result.

Corollary 1. *Under the conditions in Theorem 2, we have that*

$$\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^d}\left|P_{W|\mathcal{X}_n}((\sqrt{n}/c)(\widehat{\theta}^*-\widehat{\theta})\le x)-P_X(\sqrt{n}(\widehat{\theta}-\theta_0)\le x)\right|\xrightarrow{P_X^o}0 \tag{30}$$

as $n\to\infty$.

Corollary 1 says that the bootstrap distribution of $(\sqrt{n}/c)(\widehat{\theta}^*-\widehat{\theta})$ asymptotically imitates the unconditional distribution of $\sqrt{n}(\widehat{\theta}-\theta_0)$.

Remark 3. *For any consistent* $\widehat{\Sigma}^*\xrightarrow{P_{XW}^o}\Sigma$ *and* $\widehat{\Sigma}\xrightarrow{P_X}\Sigma$, *we have*

$$(\sqrt{n}/c)(\widehat{\Sigma}^*)^{-1/2}(\widehat{\theta}^*-\widehat{\theta})\Longrightarrow N(0,I), \tag{31}$$

$$\sup_x\left|P_{W|\mathcal{X}_n}\left(\frac{(\sqrt{n}/c)(\widehat{\theta}^*-\widehat{\theta})}{(\widehat{\Sigma}^*)^{1/2}}\le x\right)-P_X\left(\frac{\sqrt{n}(\widehat{\theta}-\theta_0)}{\widehat{\Sigma}^{1/2}}\le x\right)\right|\xrightarrow{P_X^o}0 \tag{32}$$

by Theorem 2, Slutsky's Theorem and the arguments in proving Corollary 1. An appropriate candidate for the consistent $\widehat{\Sigma}^*$ *is the block jackknife proposed in [24].*

2.4. *Bootstrap Confidence Sets.* In this subsection, we show that the distribution consistency of the bootstrap estimator $\widehat{\theta}^*$ proven in Corollary 1 implies the consistency of a variety of bootstrap confidence sets, i.e. *percentile*, *hybrid* and t types.

A lower α-th quantile of bootstrap distribution is any quantity $\tau_{n\alpha}^*\in\mathbb{R}^d$ satisfying $\tau_{n\alpha}^*=\inf\{\epsilon:P_{W|\mathcal{X}_n}(\widehat{\theta}^*\le\epsilon)\ge\alpha\}$, where ϵ is an infimum over the given set only if there does not exist a $\epsilon_1<\epsilon$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$ such that $P_{W|\mathcal{X}_n}(\widehat{\theta}^*\le\epsilon_1)\ge\alpha$. Because of the assumed smoothness of the criterion function $m(\theta,\eta)$ in our setting, we can, without loss of generality, assume $P_{W|\mathcal{X}_n}(\widehat{\theta}^*\le\tau_{n\alpha}^*)=\alpha$. We can also define $\kappa_{n\alpha}^*=(\sqrt{n}/c)(\tau_{n\alpha}^*-\widehat{\theta})$ so that $P_{W|\mathcal{X}_n}((\sqrt{n}/c)(\widehat{\theta}^*-\widehat{\theta})\le\kappa_{n\alpha}^*)=\alpha$. Note that $\tau_{n\alpha}^*$ and $\kappa_{n\alpha}^*$ are not unique since we assume θ is a vector.

Recall that, for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\begin{aligned} P_X(\sqrt{n}(\widehat{\theta} - \theta_0) \leq x) &\longrightarrow \Psi(x), \\ P_{W|\mathcal{X}_n}((\sqrt{n}/c)(\widehat{\theta}^* - \widehat{\theta}) \leq x) &\overset{P_X^o}{\longrightarrow} \Psi(x), \end{aligned}$$

where $\Psi(x) = P(N(0,\Sigma) \leq x)$, by (14) and (28). By invoking the quantile convergence Theorem, i.e. Lemma 21.1 in [35], we know $\kappa^*_{n\alpha} \overset{P_{XW}}{\longrightarrow} \Psi^{-1}(\alpha)$. Considering the Slutsky's Theorem which implies $\sqrt{n}(\widehat{\theta}-\theta_0)-\kappa^*_{n(\alpha/2)}$ weakly converges to $N(0,\Sigma) - \Psi^{-1}(\alpha/2)$ unconditionally, we further have

$$\begin{aligned} P_{XW}\left(\theta_0 \leq \widehat{\theta} - \frac{\kappa^*_{n(\alpha/2)}}{\sqrt{n}}\right) &= P_{XW}\left(\sqrt{n}(\widehat{\theta} - \theta_0) \geq \kappa^*_{n(\alpha/2)}\right) \\ &\longrightarrow P_{XW}\left(N(0,\Sigma) \geq \Psi^{-1}(\alpha/2)\right) = 1 - \alpha/2. \end{aligned}$$

The above arguments prove the consistency of the *hybrid*-type bootstrap confidence set, i.e. (34), and can also be applied to the *percentile*-type bootstrap confidence set, i.e. (33). More rigorous proof can be found in Lemma 23.3 of [35]. The following Theorem 3 summarizes the above discussions.

THEOREM 3. *Under the conditions in Theorem 2, we have*

$$P_{XW}\left(\widehat{\theta} + \frac{\tau^*_{n(\alpha/2)} - \widehat{\theta}}{c} \leq \theta_0 \leq \widehat{\theta} + \frac{\tau^*_{n(1-\alpha/2)} - \widehat{\theta}}{c}\right) \longrightarrow 1 - \alpha, \tag{33}$$

$$P_{XW}\left(\widehat{\theta} - \frac{\kappa^*_{n(1-\alpha/2)}}{\sqrt{n}} \leq \theta_0 \leq \widehat{\theta} - \frac{\kappa^*_{n(\alpha/2)}}{\sqrt{n}}\right) \longrightarrow 1 - \alpha, \tag{34}$$

as $n \to \infty$.

It is well known that the above bootstrap confidence sets can be obtained easily through routine bootstrap sampling.

Investigating the consistency of the bootstrap variance estimator is also of great interest. However, the usual sufficient condition for moment consistency, i.e. uniform integrability condition, becomes very hard to verify due to the existence of an infinite dimensional parameter η. An alternative resampling method to obtain the bootstrap variance estimator in semiparametric models is the block jackknife approach, which was proposed and theoretically justified in [24]. We do not pursue this topic further in this paper.

REMARK 4. *Provided consistent variance estimators $\widehat{\Sigma}^*$ and $\widehat{\Sigma}$ are available, we can prove that the following t-type bootstrap confidence set is also consistent by applying Lemma 23.3 in [35] to (16) and (31):*

$$P_{XW}\left(\widehat{\theta}-\frac{\widehat{\Sigma}^{1/2}\omega^*_{n(1-\alpha/2)}}{\sqrt{n}}\leq\theta_0\leq\widehat{\theta}-\frac{\widehat{\Sigma}^{1/2}\omega^*_{n(\alpha/2)}}{\sqrt{n}}\right)\longrightarrow 1-\alpha,$$

as $n\to\infty$, where $\omega^*_{n\alpha}$ satisfies $P_{W|\mathcal{X}_n}((\sqrt{n}/c)(\widehat{\theta}^*-\widehat{\theta})/(\widehat{\Sigma}^*)^{1/2}\leq\omega^*_{n\alpha})=\alpha$.

3. Verifications of Conditions S1-S2 and SB1-SB2.

In this section, we discuss how to verify Conditions S1–S2 and SB1–SB2 in Subsection 3.1 and 3.2, respectively. Two general theorems are given in Section 4 to assist verifying the remaining convergence rate conditions S3 and SB3.

3.1. *Verifications of Conditions S1-S2.*

The continuity modulus condition (9) in S1 can be checked via one of the following two approaches. The first approach is to show the boundedness of $E^o_X\|\mathbb{G}_n\|_{\mathcal{S}_n}$ by using Lemma 3.4.2 in [34]. The second approach is to calculate the bracketing entropy number of $\mathcal{S}_n$ and apply Lemma 5.13 in [36] if L_2-norm is used on the nuisance parameter. As for (10), we can verify it easily if we can show that the class of functions $\{(\partial/\partial\theta)\widetilde{m}(\theta,\eta):(\theta,\eta)\in\mathcal{C}_n\}$ is P-Donsker.

Next, we discuss how to verify the smoothness condition S2. We first write $P_X(\widetilde{m}(\theta,\eta)-\widetilde{m}_0)$ as the sum of $P_X(\widetilde{m}(\theta,\eta)-\widetilde{m}(\theta_0,\eta))$ and $P_X(\widetilde{m}(\theta_0,\eta)-$

$\widetilde{m}_0$). We apply the Taylor expansion to $P_X(\widetilde{m}(\theta,\eta)-\widetilde{m}(\theta_0,\eta))$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& P_X(\widetilde{m}(\theta,\eta)-\widetilde{m}(\theta_0,\eta)) \\
= \;& P_X\left\{m_{11}(\theta_0,\eta)-m_{21}(\theta_0,\eta)[H^\dagger(\theta_0,\eta)]\right\}(\theta-\theta_0)+O(\|\theta-\theta_0\|^2) \\
= \;& A(\theta-\theta_0)+O(\|\theta-\theta_0\|^2)+(\theta-\theta_0)O(\|\eta-\eta_0\|),
\end{aligned}$$

where A is defined in Condition I, the first and second equality follows from the Taylor expansion of $\theta\mapsto P_X\widetilde{m}(\theta,\eta)$ around θ_0 and

$$\eta\mapsto P_X\left\{m_{11}(\theta_0,\eta)-m_{21}(\theta_0,\eta)[H^\dagger(\theta_0,\eta)]\right\}$$

around η_0, respectively. By applying the second order Taylor expansion to $\eta\mapsto P_X\widetilde{m}(\theta_0,\eta)$ around η_0 and considering (4), we can show that $P(\widetilde{m}(\theta_0,\eta)-\widetilde{m}_0)=O(\|\eta-\eta_0\|^2)$. In summary, Condition S2 usually holds in models where the map $\eta\mapsto\widetilde{m}(\theta_0,\eta)$ is smooth in the sense that the Fréchet derivative of $\eta\mapsto P_X((\partial/\partial\theta)\widetilde{m}(\theta_0,\eta))$ around η_0 and the second order Fréchet derivative of $\eta\mapsto P_X\widetilde{m}(\theta_0,\eta)$ around η_0 are bounded as discussed above.

3.2. *Verifications of Conditions SB1-SB2.* We can verify Condition SB1 by showing either $S_n(x)$ is uniformly bounded, i.e., $\limsup_{n\to\infty}S_n(x)\leq M<\infty$ for every $x\in\mathcal{X}$, or more generally, $\limsup_{n\to\infty}E\{S_n(X_1)^{2+\delta}\}<\infty$ for some $\delta>0$. That the moment condition implies Condition SB1 follows from the Chebyshev's inequality. In our examples in Section 5, the uniformly boundedness condition is usually satisfied. Hence, we focus on how to show $S_n(x)$ is uniformly bounded here. By the Taylor expansion in a Banach space [40], we can write $\widetilde{m}(\theta_0,\eta)-\widetilde{m}_0=D_{\widetilde{\eta}}[\eta-\eta_0]$, where $\widetilde{\eta}$ lies on the line segment between η and η_0, and $D_\xi[h]$ is the Fréchet derivative of $\eta\mapsto\widetilde{m}(\theta_0,\eta)$ at ξ along the direction h. Since we require $\|\eta-\eta_0\|\leq\delta_n\to 0$, the bounded

Fréchet derivative at η_0 will imply that $S_n(x)$ is uniformly bounded. The method in verifying (10) of Condition S1 can be applied to check Condition SB2; see the discussion in the previous subsection.

4. Convergence Rates of Bootstrap Estimate of Functional Parameter.

In this section, we present two general theorems for calculating the convergence rate of the bootstrap estimate of the functional parameter. These results can be applied to verify Condition SB3. The convergence rate condition S3 can also be verified based on these theorems by assuming the weights $W_{ni} = 1$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$. Note that both theorems extend general results on M-estimators [27, 34] to bootstrap M-estimators and are also of independent interest.

4.1. *Root-n rate.*

In the first theorem we consider a collection of measurable objective functions $x \mapsto k(\theta, \eta)[g](x)$ indexed by the parameter $(\theta, \eta) \in \Theta \times \mathcal{H}$ and an arbitrary index set $g \in \mathbf{G}$. For example, $k(\theta, \eta)[g]$ can be the score function for η given any fixed θ indexed by $g \in \mathbf{G}$. Define

$$\begin{aligned} U_n^*(\theta,\eta)[g] &= \mathbb{P}_n^* k(\theta,\eta)[g], \\ U_n(\theta,\eta)[g] &= \mathbb{P}_n k(\theta,\eta)[g], \\ U(\theta,\eta)[g] &= P_X k(\theta,\eta)[g]. \end{aligned}$$

We assume that the maps $g \mapsto U_n^*(\theta, \eta)[g]$, $g \mapsto U_n(\theta, \eta)[g]$ and $g \mapsto U(\theta, \eta)[g]$ are uniformly bounded, so that U_n^*, U_n and U are viewed as maps from the parameter set $\Theta \times \mathcal{H}$ into $\ell^\infty(\mathbf{G})$. The following conditions are assumed in Theorem 4 below:

$$\{k(\theta,\eta)[g] : \|\theta-\theta_0\| + \|\eta-\eta_0\| \le \delta, g \in \mathbf{G}\} \in M(P_X) \cap L_2(P_X) \tag{35}$$

and is P-Donsker for some $\delta > 0$,

$$\sup_{g\in\mathbf{G}} P_X \left\{k(\theta,\eta)[g] - k(\theta_0,\eta_0)[g]\right\}^2 \to 0 \text{ as } \|\theta-\theta_0\| + \|\eta-\eta_0\| \to 0. \tag{36}$$

Let

$$\mathcal{D}_n = \left\{\frac{k(\theta,\eta)[g] - k(\theta_0,\eta_0)[g]}{1+\sqrt{n}\|\theta-\theta_0\| + \sqrt{n}\|\eta-\eta_0\|} : g \in \mathbf{G}, \|\theta-\theta_0\| + \|\eta-\eta_0\| \le \delta_n\right\}$$

and $D_n(X)$ be the envelop function of the class of functions $\mathcal{D}_n$. For any sequence $\delta_n \to 0$, we assume that $D_n(X)$ satisfies

$$\lim_{\lambda\to\infty} \lim_{n\to\infty} \sup \sup_{t\ge\lambda} t^2 P_X^o(D_n(X_1) > t) = 0. \tag{37}$$

Now we consider the convergence rate of $\widehat{\eta}^*_{\widetilde{\theta}}$ satisfying:

$$U_n^*(\widetilde{\theta}, \widehat{\eta}^*_{\widetilde{\theta}})[g] = O^o_{P_{XW}}(n^{-1/2}) \tag{38}$$

for any $\widetilde{\theta} \overset{P^o_{XW}}{\longrightarrow} \theta_0$ and g ranging over $\mathbf{G}$. In the below Theorem 4, we will show that $\widehat{\eta}^*_{\widetilde{\theta}}$ has the root-n convergence rate under the conditions (35)–(37).

THEOREM 4. *Suppose that $U : \Theta \times \mathcal{H} \mapsto \ell^\infty(\mathbf{G})$ is Fréchet differentiable at (θ_0, η_0) with bounded derivative $\dot{U} : \mathbb{R}^d \times lin\mathcal{H} \mapsto \ell^\infty(\mathbf{G})$ such that the map $\dot{U}(0,\cdot) : lin\mathcal{H} \mapsto \ell^\infty(\mathbf{G})$ is invertible with an inverse that is continuous on its range. Furthermore, assume that (35)-(37) hold, and that $U(\theta_0,\eta_0) = 0$, then*

$$\|\widehat{\eta}^*_{\widetilde{\theta}} - \eta_0\| = O^o_{P_W}(\|\widetilde{\theta}-\theta_0\| \vee n^{-1/2}) \tag{39}$$

in P^o_X-probability, given that $\widetilde{\theta} \overset{P^o_{XW}}{\longrightarrow} \theta_0$ and $\widehat{\eta}^*_{\widetilde{\theta}} \overset{P^o_{XW}}{\longrightarrow} \eta_0$.

4.2. *Slower than root-n rate.* We next present another Theorem which yields slower than $\sqrt{n}$ convergence rate for the bootstrap M-estimate of the functional parameter. This result is so general that it can be applied to the sieve estimate of the nuisance parameter [11]. The essence of the sieve method is that a sequence of increasing spaces (sieves), i.e. $\mathcal{H}_n$, is employed to approximate the large parameter space, e.g. $\mathcal{H}$, so that asymptotically, the closure of the limiting space contains the original parameter space. In other words, for any $\eta \in \mathcal{H}$, there exists a $\pi_n\eta \in \mathcal{H}_n$ such that $\|\eta - \pi_n\eta\| \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$.

Now we consider the M-estimate $\widehat{\eta}_\theta^* \in \mathcal{H}_n$ satisfying

$$\mathbb{P}_n^* v(\theta, \widehat{\eta}_\theta^*) \geq \mathbb{P}_n^* v(\theta, \eta_n) \ \text{ for any } \theta \in \Theta \text{ and some } \eta_n \in \mathcal{H}_n, \tag{40}$$

where $x \mapsto v(\theta, \eta)(x)$ is a measurable objective function. Let " $\lesssim$ " and " $\gtrsim$ " denote greater than or smaller than, up to an universal constant. We assume the following conditions hold for every $\delta > 0$:

$$E_X(v(\theta,\eta) - v(\theta,\eta_n)) \lesssim -d^2(\eta,\eta_n) + \|\theta - \theta_0\|^2, \tag{41}$$

$$E_X^o \sup_{\theta\in\Theta, \eta\in\mathcal{H}_n, \|\theta-\theta_0\|\leq\delta, d(\eta,\eta_n)\leq\delta} |\mathbb{G}_n(v(\theta,\eta) - v(\theta,\eta_n))| \lesssim \psi_n(\delta), \tag{42}$$

$$E_{XW}^o \sup_{\theta\in\Theta, \eta\in\mathcal{H}_n, \|\theta-\theta_0\|\leq\delta, d(\eta,\eta_n)\leq\delta} |\mathbb{G}_n^*(v(\theta,\eta) - v(\theta,\eta_n))| \lesssim \psi_n^*(\delta). \tag{43}$$

Here $d^2(\eta, \eta_n)$ may be thought of as the square of a distance, i.e. $\|\eta - \eta_n\|^2$, but our theorem is also true for any arbitrary function $\eta \mapsto d^2(\eta, \eta_n)$.

THEOREM 5. *Suppose that Conditions (41)-(43) hold. We assume (42) ((43)) is valid for functions ψ_n (ψ_n^*) such that $\delta \mapsto \psi_n(\delta)/\delta^\alpha$ ($\delta \mapsto$*

$\psi_n^*(\delta)/\delta^\alpha$) is decreasing for some $0 < \alpha < 2$. Then, for every $(\widetilde{\theta}, \widehat{\eta}^*_{\widetilde{\theta}})$ satisfying $P(\widetilde{\theta} \in \Theta, \widehat{\eta}^*_{\widetilde{\theta}} \in \mathcal{H}_n) \to 1$, we have

$$d(\widehat{\eta}^*_{\widetilde{\theta}}, \eta_n) \leq O^o_{P_W}(\delta_n \vee \|\widetilde{\theta} - \theta_0\|)$$

in P^o_X-probability, for any sequence of positive numbers δ_n satisfying both $\psi_n(\delta_n) \leq \sqrt{n}\delta_n^2$ and $\psi_n^*(\delta_n) \leq \sqrt{n}\delta_n^2$ for every n.

In application of Theorem 5, the parameter η_n is taken to be some element in $\mathcal{H}_n$ that is very close to η_0. When $\mathcal{H}_n = \mathcal{H}$, a natural choice for η_n is η_0 and we can directly use Theorem 5 to derive the convergence rate $d(\widehat{\eta}^*_{\widetilde{\theta}}, \eta_0)$ as shown in the examples of Section 5. In general, η_n may be taken as the maximizer of the mapping $\eta \mapsto P_X v(\theta_0, \eta)$ over $\mathcal{H}_n$, the projection of η_0 onto $\mathcal{H}_n$. Then we need to consider the approximation rate of the sieve space $\mathcal{H}_n$ to $\mathcal{H}$, i.e. $d(\eta_n, \eta_0)$, since $d(\widehat{\eta}^*_{\widetilde{\theta}}, \eta_0) \leq d(\widehat{\eta}^*_{\widetilde{\theta}}, \eta_n) + d(\eta_n, \eta_0)$. The approximation rate $d(\eta_n, \eta_0)$ depends on the choices of sieves and is usually derived in the mathematical literature. Here, we skip further discussion and refer readers to [4].

Now we discuss verification of the nontrivial conditions (41)–(43). The smoothness condition for $v(\theta, \eta)$, i.e. (41), is implied by

$$E_X(v(\theta,\eta) - v(\theta_0,\eta_n)) \quad \lesssim \quad -d^2(\eta,\eta_n) - \|\theta - \theta_0\|^2, \tag{44}$$

$$E_X(v(\theta,\eta_n) - v(\theta_0,\eta_n)) \quad \gtrsim \quad -\|\theta - \theta_0\|^2. \tag{45}$$

The two conditions depict the quadratic behaviors of the criterion functions $(\theta, \eta) \mapsto E_X v(\theta, \eta)$ and $\theta \mapsto E_X v(\theta, \eta_n)$ around the maximum point (θ_0, η_n) and θ_0, respectively. We next present one useful lemma for verifying the continuity modulus of empirical processes and its bootstrapped version, i.e.

(42) and (43). Denote

(46) $\mathcal{V}_\delta = \{x \mapsto [v(\theta,\eta)(x) - v(\theta,\eta_n)(x)] : d(\eta,\eta_n) \le \delta, \|\theta-\theta_0\| \le \delta\}$.

and define the bracketing entropy integral of $\mathcal{V}_\delta$ as

$$K(\delta,\mathcal{V}_\delta,L_2(P_X)) = \int_0^\delta \sqrt{1+\log N_{[]}(\epsilon,\mathcal{V}_\delta,L_2(P_X))}d\epsilon, \tag{47}$$

where $\log N_{[]}(\delta,\mathcal{A},d)$ is the δ-bracketing entropy number for the class $\mathcal{A}$ under the distance measure d.

LEMMA 1. *Suppose that the functions* $(x,\theta,\eta) \mapsto v_{\theta,\eta}(x)$ *are uniformly bounded for* (θ,η) *ranging over some neighborhood of* (θ_0,η_n) *and that*

$$E_X(v_{\theta,\eta} - v_{\theta,\eta_n})^2 \lesssim d^2(\eta,\eta_n) + \|\theta-\theta_0\|^2. \tag{48}$$

Then Condition (42) is satisfied for any functions ψ_n *such that*

$$\psi_n(\delta) \ge K(\delta,\mathcal{V}_\delta,L_2(P_X))\left(1+\frac{K(\delta,\mathcal{V}_\delta,L_2(P_X))}{\delta^2\sqrt{n}}\right). \tag{49}$$

Let $V_n(X)$ *be the envelop function of the class* $\mathcal{V}_{\delta_n}$*. If we further assume that, for each sequence* $\delta_n \to 0$*, the envelop functions* V_n *satisfies*

$$\lim_{\lambda\to\infty}\lim\sup_{n\to\infty}\sup_{t\ge\lambda} t^2 P_X^o(V_n(X_1) > t) = 0, \tag{50}$$

then Condition (43) is satisfied for any functions ψ_n^* *such that*

$$\psi_n^*(\delta) \ge K(\delta,\mathcal{V}_\delta,L_2(P_X))\left(1+\frac{K(\delta,\mathcal{V}_\delta,L_2(P_X))}{\delta^2\sqrt{n}}\right). \tag{51}$$

REMARK 5. *Note that the inequalities* $\psi_n(\delta) \lesssim \sqrt{n}\delta^2$ *and* $\psi_n^*(\delta) \lesssim \sqrt{n}\delta^2$ *are equivalent with* $K(\delta,\mathcal{V}_\delta,L_2(P_X)) \lesssim \sqrt{n}\delta^2$ *when we let* ψ_n *and* ψ_n^* *be equal to right hand side of (49) and (51), respectively. Consequently, the convergence rate of* $\widehat{\eta}^*_{\tilde{\theta}}$ *calculated in Theorem 5, i.e.* δ_n*, is determined by the bracketing entropy integral of* $\mathcal{V}_{\delta_n}$*.*

Remark 6. *The assumptions of Lemma 1 are relaxable to great extent. For example, we can drop the uniform bounded condition on the class of functions* $v(\theta,\eta)$ *by using the "Bernstein norm", i.e.* $\|f\|_{P,B} = (2P(e^{|f|} - 1 - |f|))^{1/2}$*, instead of the* L_2*-norm. In some cases, the bracketing entropy integral diverges at zero. Then we can replace (47) by the integral:*

$$K(\delta, \mathcal{V}_\delta, L_2(P_X)) = \int_{c\delta^2\wedge\delta/3}^{\delta} \sqrt{1+\log N_{[]}(\epsilon, \mathcal{V}_\delta, L_2(P_X))}d\epsilon,$$

for some small positive constant c*, see Lemma 3.4.3 and page 326 in [34].*

5. Examples.

In this section, we apply the main results in Section 2 to justify the bootstrap validity of drawing semiparametric inferences in three examples of semiparametric models. In the first two examples, we use the log-likelihood as the criterion function, while in the last example, the least squares criterion is used. The M-estimate of the nuisance functional parameters have different convergence rates in these examples. This section also serves the purpose of illustration on verification of the technical conditions used in the general results.

5.1. *Cox Regression Model with Right Censored Data.*

In the Cox regression model, the hazard function of the survival time T of a subject with covariate Z is modelled as:

$$\lambda(t|z) \equiv \lim_{\Delta\to 0}\frac{1}{\Delta}P(t \le T < t+\Delta | T \ge t, Z = z) = \lambda(t)\exp(\theta' z), \tag{52}$$

where λ is an unspecified baseline hazard function and θ is a regression vector. In this model, we are usually interested in θ while treating the cumulative hazard function $\eta(y) = \int_0^y \lambda(t)dt$ as the nuisance parameter. The

MLE for θ is proven to be semiparametric efficient and widely used in applications. Here we consider bootstrapping $\widehat{\theta}$, which corresponds to treating log-likelihood as the criterion function $m(\theta, \eta)$ in our general formulation.

With right censoring of survival time, the data observed is $X = (Y, \delta, Z)$, where $Y = T \wedge C$, C is a censoring time, $\delta = I\{T \leq C\}$, and Z is a regression covariate belonging to a compact set $\mathbb{Z} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. We assume that C is independent of T given Z. The log-likelihood is obtained as

$$m(\theta, \eta) = \delta\theta' z - \exp(\theta' z)\eta(y) + \delta \log \eta\{y\}, \tag{53}$$

where $\eta\{y\} = \eta(y) - \eta(y-)$ is a point mass that denotes the jump of η at point y. The parameter space $\mathcal{H}$ is restricted to a set of nondecreasing cadlag functions on the interval $[0, \tau]$ with $\eta(\tau) \leq M$ for some constant M. By some algebra, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{m}(\theta, \eta)(x) &= m_1(\theta, \eta) - m_2(\theta, \eta)[H^\dagger(\theta, \eta)] \\ &= [\delta z - z \exp(\theta' z)\eta(y)] \\ &\quad - \left[\delta H^\dagger(\theta, \eta)(y) - \exp(\theta' z) \int_0^y H^\dagger(\theta, \eta)(u) d\eta(u)\right], \end{aligned}$$

where

$$H^\dagger(\theta, \eta)(y) = \frac{E_{\theta,\eta} Z \exp(\theta' Z) 1\{Y \geq y\}}{E_{\theta,\eta} \exp(\theta' Z) 1\{Y \geq y\}}.$$

Conditions I, S1-S3 in guaranteeing the asymptotic normality of $\widehat{\theta}$ have been verified in [6]. In particular, the convergence rate of the estimated nuisance parameter is established in theorem 3.1 of [27], i.e.

$$\|\widehat{\eta}_{\widetilde{\theta}_n} - \eta_0\|_\infty = O_{P_X}(n^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \|\widetilde{\theta}_n - \theta_0\|), \tag{54}$$

where $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ denotes the supreme norm. We next verify the bootstrap consistency conditions, i.e., SB1-SB3. Condition SB1 trivially holds since it is easy to show that $\eta \mapsto \widetilde{m}(\theta_0, \eta)$ has bounded Fréchet derivative around η_0. The P-Donsker condition SB2 has been verified when verifying (10) in condition S1. In the end we will verify the bootstrap convergence rate condition $\|\widehat{\eta}^*_{\widetilde{\theta}} - \eta_0\|_\infty = O^o_{P_{XW}}(\|\widetilde{\theta} - \theta_0\| \vee n^{-1/2})$ via Theorem 4. Since $\widehat{\eta}^*_\theta$ maximizes $\mathbb{P}^*_n m(\theta, \eta)$ for fixed θ, we set $k(\theta, \eta)[g] = m_2(\theta, \eta)[g]$ and have $U^*_n(\theta, \widehat{\eta}^*_\theta)[g] = \mathbb{P}^*_n m_2(\theta, \widehat{\eta}^*_\theta)[g] = 0$. The invertibility of $\dot{W}(0, \cdot)$, the conditions (35) and (36) have been verified in [27] when they showed (54). Now we only need to consider the condition (37): for n so large that $\delta_n \le R$

$$\begin{aligned} D_n(x) &\equiv \sup\left\{\frac{|(m_2(\theta,\eta)[g]) - m_2(\theta_0,\eta_0)[g]|}{1+\sqrt{n}(\|\theta-\theta_0\| + \|\eta-\eta_0\|_\infty)}, g \in \mathbf{G},\right. \\ &\qquad \|\theta-\theta_0\| + \|\eta-\eta_0\|_\infty \le \delta_n\} \\ &\le 2\sup\{|m_2(\theta,\eta)[g]|, g\in\mathbf{G}, \|\theta-\theta_0\| + \|\eta-\eta_0\|_\infty \le R\} \\ &\le \text{some constant.} \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality follows from the assumption that $\mathbf{G}$ is a class of functions of bounded total variation and the inequality that $\int_0^y g(u)d\eta(u) \le \eta(\tau)\|g\|_{BV}$, where $\|g\|_{BV}$ is the total variation of the function g. Thus, the condition (37) holds trivially.

5.2. *Cox Regression Model with Current Status Data.* We next consider the current status data when each subject is observed at a single examination time C to determine if an event has occurred. The event time T cannot be known exactly. Then the observed data are n i.i.d. realizations of $X = (C, \delta, Z) \in R^+ \times \{0, 1\} \times \mathbb{Z}$, where $\delta = I\{T \le C\}$ and Z is a vector of covariates. The corresponding criterion function, i.e. the log-likelihood, is derived as

$$(55)\; m(\theta, \eta) = \delta \log[1 - \exp(-\eta(c)\exp(\theta' z))] - (1-\delta)\exp(\theta' z)\eta(c).$$

We make the following assumptions throughout the rest of this subsection: (i) T and C are independent given Z; (ii) the covariance of $Z - E(Z|C)$ is positive definite, which guarantees the efficient information to be positive definite; (iii) C possesses a Lebesgue density which is continuous and positive on its support $[\sigma, \tau]$, for which the true nuisance parameter η_0 satisfies $\eta_0(\sigma-) > 0$ and $\eta_0(\tau) < M < \infty$, and this density is continuously differentiable on $[\sigma, \tau]$ with derivative bounded above and bounded below by zero. The form of $\widetilde{m}(\theta, \eta)$ can be found in [7] as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{m}(\theta, \eta) &= m_1(\theta, \eta) - m_2(\theta, \eta)[H^{\dagger}(\theta, \eta)] \\ &= (z\eta(c) - H^{\dagger}(\theta, \eta)(c))Q(x; \theta, \eta) \end{aligned}$$

where

$$Q(x; \theta, \eta) = e^{\theta' z}\left[\delta \frac{1}{\exp(e^{\theta' z}\eta(c)) - 1} - (1 - \delta)\right]$$

and the form of $H^{\dagger}(\theta, \eta)(c)$ is given in (4) of [7].

Conditions I and S1-S3 are verified in [7]. Conditions SB1 and SB2 can be checked similarly as in the previous example. Note that the convergence rate for the nuisance parameter becomes slower, i.e.

$$\|\widehat{\eta}_{\widetilde{\theta}_n} - \eta_0\|_2 = O_{P_X}(\|\widetilde{\theta}_n - \theta_0\| + n^{-1/3}), \tag{56}$$

where $\|\cdot\|_2$ denotes the regular L_2-norm, due to the less information provided by the current status data, as shown in [27]. By Theorem 5 we can show that the same convergence rate, i.e. $n^{-1/3}$, also holds for the bootstrap estimate for η, i.e. $\widehat{\eta}^*_{\theta}$. The assumptions (41) and (42) in Theorem 5 are verified in [27] when showing (56). As for the last assumption (43), we apply Lemma 1. We show that Condition (50) on the envelop function $V_n(x)$ holds: for n so large that $\delta_n \leq R$

$$\begin{aligned} V_n(x) &\equiv \sup\{|m(\theta,\eta) - m(\theta,\eta_0)| : \|\eta-\eta_0\|_2 \leq \delta_n, \|\theta-\theta_0\| \leq \delta_n\} \\ &\leq 2\sup\{|m(\theta,\eta)| : \|\eta-\eta_0\|_2 \leq R, \|\theta-\theta_0\| \leq R\} \\ &\leq \text{some constant.} \end{aligned}$$

5.3. *Partly Linear Models.* In this example, a continuous outcome variable Y, depending on the covariates $(W, Z) \in [0,1]^2$, is modelled as

$$Y = \theta W + f(Z) + \xi,$$

where ξ is independent of (W, Z) and f is an unknown smooth function belonging to $\mathcal{H} \equiv \{f : [0,1] \mapsto [0,1], \int_0^1 (f^{(k)}(u))^2 du \leq M\}$ for a fixed $0 < M < \infty$. In addition we assume $E(Var(W|Z))$ is positive definite and $E\{f(Z)\} = 0$. We want to estimate (θ, f) using the least square criterion:

$$m(\theta, f) = -(y - \theta w - f(z))^2. \tag{57}$$

Note that the above model would be more flexible if we did not require knowledge of M. A sieve estimator could be obtained if we replaced M with a sequence $M_n \to \infty$. The theory we develop in this paper will be applicable in this setting, but, in order to maintain clarity of exposition, we have elected not to pursue this more complicated situation here. An alternative approach is to use penalization, the study of which is beyond the scope of the present paper.

Simple calculations give

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{m}(\theta,\eta)(x) &= m_1(\theta,\eta) - m_2(\theta,\eta)[H^\dagger(\theta,\eta)] \\ &= 2(y - \theta w - f(z))(w - H^\dagger(\theta,\eta)(z)), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$H^{\dagger}(\theta,\eta)(z)=\frac{E_{\theta,\eta}(W(Y-\theta W-f(Z))^{2}|Z=z)}{E_{\theta,\eta}((Y-\theta W-f(Z))^{2}|Z=z)}.$$

The finite variance condition I follows from $E[W\{W-H^{\dagger}(\theta_0,\eta_0)(Z)\}]>0$. The distribution of ξ is assumed to have finite second moment and satisfy (6), e.g. $\xi\sim N(0,1)$. Conditions S1–S3 and SB2 can be verified using similar arguments in Example 3 of [7], in particular, $\|\widehat{f}_{\widetilde{\theta}}-f_0\|_2=O_{P_X}(\|\widetilde{\theta}-\theta_0\|\vee n^{-k/(2k+1)})$ in (12). It is easy to show that the Fréchet derivative of $\eta\mapsto\widetilde{m}(\theta_0,\eta)$ is bounded around η_0, and thus the tail condition SB1 holds. To prove $\|\hat{f}^{*}_{\widetilde{\theta}}-f_0\|_2=O^{o}_{P_{XW}}(\|\widetilde{\theta}-\theta_0\|\vee n^{-k/(2k+1)})$ via Theorem 5, we proceed as in the previous example, checking the assumption (50) using similar arguments, i.e. $V_n(x)$ is uniformly bounded.

6. Proof of Main Results.

6.1. *Proof of Theorem 1 (Semiparametric M-estimate Theorem).* By Conditions S1, S3 and the consistency of $\widehat{\theta}$, we have

$$\mathbb{G}_n(\widehat{m}-\widetilde{m}_0)=O^{o}_{P_X}(\|\widehat{\theta}-\theta_0\|\vee\|\widehat{\eta}-\eta_0\|)=O^{o}_{P_X}(\|\widehat{\theta}-\theta_0\|\vee n^{-\gamma}).$$

Considering (5), we can further simplify the above equation to

$$\sqrt{n}P_X(\widehat{m}-\widetilde{m}_0)=-\sqrt{n}\mathbb{P}_n\widetilde{m}_0+O^{o}_{P_X}(\|\widehat{\theta}-\theta_0\|\vee n^{-\gamma}). \tag{58}$$

By Conditions S2-S3 we can show that the left hand side of (58) equals

$$\sqrt{n}P_X(m_{11}(\theta_0,\eta_0)-m_{21}(\theta_0,\eta_0)[H_0^{\dagger}])(\widehat{\theta}-\theta_0)+O^{o}_{P_X}(\sqrt{n}\|\widehat{\theta}-\theta_0\|^{2}\vee n^{1/2-2\gamma}).$$

Thus (58) becomes

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \sqrt{n} P_X (m_{11}(\theta_0, \eta_0) - m_{21}(\theta_0, \eta_0)[H_0^\dagger])(\widehat{\theta} - \theta_0) \\
(59) \quad = \quad & -\sqrt{n} \mathbb{P}_n \widetilde{m}_0 + O_{P_X}^o(\|\widehat{\theta} - \theta_0\| \vee n^{-\gamma}) + O_{P_X}^o(\sqrt{n}\|\widehat{\theta} - \theta_0\|^2 \vee n^{1/2-2\gamma}) \\
= \quad & -\sqrt{n} \mathbb{P}_n \widetilde{m}_0 + O_{P_X}^o(n^{1/2-2\gamma} \vee \|\widehat{\theta} - \theta_0\| \vee \sqrt{n}\|\widehat{\theta} - \theta_0\|^2) \\
(60) \quad = \quad & O_{P_X}^o(1 \vee \sqrt{n}\|\widehat{\theta} - \theta_0\|^2),
\end{aligned}
$$

where the second equality follows from the range of γ and the third equality holds by applying CLT to $\widetilde{m}_0$. Due to the consistency of $\widehat{\theta}$ and condition I, we can conclude that $\|\widehat{\theta} - \theta_0\| = O_{P_X}^o(n^{-1/2})$ based on (60), thus $\|\widehat{\eta} - \eta_0\| = O_{P_X}^o(n^{-\gamma})$. Plugging the convergence rates for $\widehat{\theta}$ and $\widehat{\eta}$ back to (59), we complete the proof for (13). The standard CLT and (6) implies (14).

6.2. *Proof of Theorem 2 (Bootstrap Consistency Theorem).* To prove Theorem 2, we need the following lemma whose proof is given in the Appendix.

LEMMA 2. *Under the assumptions in Theorem 2, we have*

$$
(61) \qquad \mathbb{G}_n^* (\widetilde{m}(\theta, \eta) - \widetilde{m}(\theta_0, \eta_0)) = O_{P_W}^o(\|\theta - \theta_0\| \vee \|\eta - \eta_0\|)
$$

in P_X^o-Probability for $(\theta, \eta) \in \mathcal{C}_n$.

We shall use repeatedly Lemma A.1 in the Appendix, which concerns about the transition of stochastic orders among different probability spaces.

We first prove (24). Recall that $\mathbb{G}_n = \sqrt{n}(\mathbb{P}_n - P_X)$ and $\mathbb{G}_n^* = \sqrt{n}(\mathbb{P}_n^* - \mathbb{P}_n)$. Define $\widehat{m}^*$ as $\widetilde{m}(\widehat{\theta}^*, \widehat{\eta}^*)$. By some algebra, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{G}_n^* \widetilde{m}_0 + \mathbb{G}_n \widetilde{m}_0 + \sqrt{n} P_X (\widehat{m}^* - \widetilde{m}_0) \\
= \quad & \mathbb{G}_n^* (\widetilde{m}_0 - \widehat{m}^*) + \mathbb{G}_n (\widetilde{m}_0 - \widehat{m}^*) + \sqrt{n} \mathbb{P}_n^* \widehat{m}^*,
\end{aligned}
$$

since $P_X \widetilde{m}_0 = 0$. Thus we have the below inequality:

$$\begin{aligned}\|\sqrt{n}P_X(\widehat{m}^* - \widetilde{m}_0)\| &\leq \|\mathbb{G}_n^*\widetilde{m}_0\| + \|\mathbb{G}_n\widetilde{m}_0\| + \|\mathbb{G}_n^*(\widetilde{m}_0 - \widehat{m}^*)\| \\ &\quad + \|\mathbb{G}_n(\widetilde{m}_0 - \widehat{m}^*)\| + \|\sqrt{n}\mathbb{P}_n^*\widehat{m}^*\| \\ &\leq L_1 + L_2 + L_3 + L_4 + L_5. \end{aligned} \tag{62}$$

Based on Theorem 2.2 in [29], we have $L_1 = O^o_{P_W}(1)$ in P^o_X-probability. The CLT implies $L_2 = O^o_{P_X}(1)$. We next consider L_3 and L_4. By Condition SB3, we can show that $\|\widehat{\eta}^* - \eta_0\| = o^o_{P_W}(1)$ in P^o_X-probability since $\widehat{\theta}^*$ is assumed to be consistent, i.e. $\|\widehat{\theta}^* - \theta_0\| = o^o_{P_W}(1)$ in P^o_X-probability, by (A.1) and (A.5) in Lemma A.1. Then, we have $L_3 = o^o_{P_W}(1)$ in P^o_X-probability based on Lemma 2 and (A.5) in Lemma A.1. Next, we obtain that $L_4 = o^o_{P_W}(1)$ in P^o_X-probability based on Condition S1 and (A.3) in Lemma A.1. Finally, $L_5 = 0$ based on (18). In summary, (62) can be rewritten as:

$$\|\sqrt{n}P_X(\widehat{m}^* - \widetilde{m}_0)\| \leq O^o_{P_W}(1) + O^o_{P_X}(1) \tag{63}$$

in P^o_X-probability.

Let $\alpha_n = \|\widehat{\theta}^* - \theta_0\|$. Combining (11) with (63) and noticing (22), we have

$$\sqrt{n}\|A\alpha_n\| \leq O^o_{P_W}(1) + O^o_{P_X}(1) + O^o_{P_W}\left(\sqrt{n}\alpha_n^2 \vee n^{-2\gamma+1/2}\right) \tag{64}$$

in P^o_X-probability. By considering the consistency of $\widehat{\theta}^*$ and Condition I, we complete the proof of (24) based on (64).

We next prove (25). Write

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &= -\mathbb{G}_n^*(\widehat{m}^* - \widetilde{m}_0) = \sqrt{n}(\mathbb{P}_n^* - \mathbb{P}_n)(\widetilde{m}_0 - \widehat{m}^*), \\ I_2 &= \mathbb{G}_n(\widehat{m} - \widetilde{m}_0) = \sqrt{n}(\mathbb{P}_n - P_X)(\widehat{m} - \widetilde{m}_0), \\ I_3 &= -\mathbb{G}_n(\widehat{m}^* - \widetilde{m}_0) = \sqrt{n}(\mathbb{P}_n - P_X)(\widetilde{m}_0 - \widehat{m}^*), \\ I_4 &= \sqrt{n}\mathbb{P}_n^*\widehat{m}^* - \sqrt{n}\mathbb{P}_n\widehat{m}. \end{aligned}$$

By some algebra, we know that $\sqrt{n}P_X(\widehat{m}^* - \widehat{m}) + \mathbb{G}_n^*\widetilde{m}_0 = \sum_{j=1}^4 I_j$.

By the definition (20), we can show that $A_n \times B_n = O_{P_W}^o(1)$ in P_X^o-probability if A_n and B_n are both of the order $O_{P_W}^o(1)$ in P_X^o-probability. Then the root-n consistency of $\widehat{\theta}^*$ proven in (24) together with SB3 implies

$$\|\widehat{\eta}^* - \eta_0\| \vee \|\widehat{\theta}^* - \theta_0\| = O_{P_W}^*(n^{-\gamma}) \tag{65}$$

in P_X^o-probability. Thus, by Lemma 2, we know $I_1 = O_{P_W}^o(n^{-\gamma})$ in P_X^o-probability. Note that (9) and (10) of Condition S1 imply

$$\mathbb{G}_n(\widetilde{m}(\theta, \eta) - \widetilde{m}_0) = O_{P_X}^o(\|\theta - \theta_0\| \vee \|\eta - \eta_0\|) \tag{66}$$

for (θ, η) in the neighborhood of (θ_0, η_0). Considering (66), Condition S3 and Theorem 1, we have $I_2 = O_{P_X}^o(n^{-\gamma})$. By (65), (66) and (A.4), we know the order of I_3 is $O_{P_W}^o(n^{-\gamma})$ in P_X^o-probability. $I_4 = 0$ by (5) and (18).

Therefore, we have established:

$$\sqrt{n}P_X(\widehat{m}^* - \widehat{m}) = -\mathbb{G}_n^*\widetilde{m}_0 + O_{P_X}^o(n^{-\gamma}) + O_{P_W}^o(n^{-\gamma}) \tag{67}$$

in P_X^o-probability. To analyze the left hand side of (67), we rewrite it as $\sqrt{n}P_X(\widehat{m}^* - \widetilde{m}_0) - \sqrt{n}P_X(\widehat{m} - \widetilde{m}_0)$. Applying Condition S2 to both components, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \sqrt{n}P_X(m_{11}(\theta_0, \eta_0) - m_{21}(\theta_0, \eta_0)[H_0^\dagger])(\widehat{\theta}^* - \widehat{\theta}) \\ = \quad & -\mathbb{G}_n^*\widetilde{m}_0 + O_{P_X}^o(n^{-\gamma}) + O_{P_W}^o(n^{-\gamma}) + O_{P_X}^o(n^{1/2-2\gamma}) + O_{P_W}^o(n^{1/2-2\gamma}) \\ = \quad & -\mathbb{G}_n^*\widetilde{m}_0 + O_{P_X}^o(n^{1/2-2\gamma}) + O_{P_W}^o(n^{1/2-2\gamma}) \end{aligned}$$

in P_X^o-probability, by considering Condition S3, SB3 and the range of γ. By considering Conditions I and (A.2), we complete the proof of (25). The proof of (26) follows from Theorem 2.2 in [29].

APPENDIX

A.1. *Measurability and Stochastic Orders.*

Measurability Condition $M(P)$ We say that a class of random functions $\mathcal{F} \in M(P)$ if $\mathcal{F}$ is nearly linearly deviation measurable for P and that both $\mathcal{F}^2$ and $\mathcal{F}'^2$ are nearly linearly supremum measurable for P. Here $\mathcal{F}^2$ and $\mathcal{F}'^2$ denote the classes of squared functions and squared differences of functions from $\mathcal{F}$, respectively. It is known that if $\mathcal{F}$ is countable, or if $\{\mathbb{P}_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ are stochastically separable in $\mathcal{F}$, or if $\mathcal{F}$ is image admissible Suslin [10], then $\mathcal{F} \in M(P)$. More precise descriptions can be found in Page 853-854 of [12].

The following lemma is very important since it accurately describes the transition of stochastic orders among different probability spaces. We implicitly assume the random quantities in Lemma A.1 posses enough measurability so that the usual Fubini theorem can be used freely.

LEMMA A.1. *Suppose that*

$$\begin{aligned} Q_n &= o^o_{P_W}(1) \ \ \textit{in } P^o_X\textit{-Probability}, \\ R_n &= O^o_{P_W}(1) \ \ \textit{in } P^o_X\textit{-Probability}. \end{aligned}$$

We have

$$A_n = o^o_{P_{XW}}(1) \iff A_n = o^o_{P_W}(1) \ \ \textit{in } P^o_X\textit{-Probability}, \tag{A.1}$$

$$B_n = O^o_{P_{XW}}(1) \iff B_n = O^o_{P_W}(1) \ \ \textit{in } P^o_X\textit{-Probability}, \tag{A.2}$$

$$C_n = Q_n \times O^o_{P_X}(1) \implies C_n = o^o_{P_W}(1) \ \ \textit{in } P^o_X\textit{-Probability}, \tag{A.3}$$

$$D_n = R_n \times O^o_{P_X}(1) \implies D_n = O^o_{P_W}(1) \ \ \textit{in } P^o_X\textit{-Probability}, \tag{A.4}$$

$$E_n = Q_n \times R_n \implies E_n = o^o_{P_W}(1) \ \ \textit{in } P^o_X\textit{-Probability}. \tag{A.5}$$

Proof: To verify (A.1), we have for every $\epsilon, \nu > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} P_X^o\left\{P_{W|X}^o(|A_n| \geq \epsilon) \geq \nu\right\} &\leq \frac{1}{\nu} E_X^o P_{W|X}^o(|A_n| \geq \epsilon) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\nu} E_X^o E_{W|X}^o 1\{|A_n| \geq \epsilon\} \end{aligned} \tag{A.6}$$

based on the Markov's inequality. Based on Lemma 6.5 and 6.14 in [19], we have $E_X^o E_{W|X}^o 1\{|A_n| \geq \epsilon\} \leq E_{XW}^o 1\{|A_n| \geq \epsilon\} = P_{XW}^o(|A_n| \geq \epsilon)$, and thus

$$P_X^o\left\{P_{W|X}^o(|A_n| \geq \epsilon) \geq \nu\right\} \leq \frac{1}{\nu} P_{XW}^o(|A_n| \geq \epsilon). \tag{A.7}$$

¿From (A.7), we can conclude that if $A_n = o_{P_{XW}}^o(1)$, then $A_n = o_{P_W}^o(1)$ in P_X^o-probability. Another direction of (A.1) follows from the following inequalities: for any $\epsilon, \eta > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & P_{XW}^o(|A_n| \geq \epsilon) = E_X^o\{P_{W|X}^o(|A_n| \geq \epsilon)\} \\ = \ & E_X^o\{P_{W|X}^o(|A_n| \geq \epsilon) 1\{P_{W|X}^o(|A_n| \geq \epsilon) \geq \eta\}\} \\ & + E_X^o\{P_{W|X}^o(|A_n| \geq \epsilon) 1\{P_{W|X}^o(|A_n| \geq \epsilon) < \eta\}\} \\ \leq \ & E_X^o\{1\{P_{W|X}^o(|A_n| \geq \epsilon) \geq \eta\}\} + \eta \\ \leq \ & P_X^o\{P_W^o(|A_n| \geq \epsilon) \geq \eta\} + \eta. \end{aligned} \tag{A.8}$$

Note that the first term in (A.8) can be made arbitrarily small by the assumption that $A_n = o_{P_W}^o(1)$ in P_X^o-Probability. Since η can be chosen arbitrarily small, we can show $\lim_{n\rightarrow\infty} P_{XW}^o(|A_n| \geq \epsilon) = 0$ for any $\epsilon > 0$. This completes the proof of (A.1). (A.2) can be shown similarly by using the inequalities (A.6) and (A.8).

As for (A.3), we establish the following inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned}
& P_X^o\left\{P_{W|X}^o(|Q_n \times O_{P_X}^o(1)| \geq \epsilon) \geq \nu\right\} \\
\leq\ & P_X^o\left\{P_{W|X}^o(|Q_n| \geq \epsilon/|O_{P_X}^o(1)|) \geq \nu\right\} \\
\leq\ & P_X^o\{P_{W|X}^o(|Q_n| \geq \epsilon/M) + P_{W|X}^o(|O_{P_X}^o(1)| \geq M) \geq \nu\} \\
\leq\ & P_X^o\{P_{W|X}^o(|Q_n| \geq \epsilon/M) \geq \nu/2\} + P_X^o\{P_{W|X}^o(|O_{P_X}^o(1)| \geq M) \geq \nu/2\} \\
\leq\ & P_X^o\{P_{W|X}^o(|Q_n| \geq \epsilon/M) \geq \nu/2\} + \frac{2}{\nu}P_X^o(|O_{P_X}^o(1)| \geq M)
\end{aligned}$$

for any $\epsilon, \nu, M > 0$. Since M can be chosen arbitrarily large, we can show (A.3) by considering the definition of $O_{P_X}^o(1)$. The proof of (A.4) is similar by using the above set of inequalities. The proof of (A.3) can be carried over to that of (A.5). Similarly, we establish the below inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned}
& P_X^o\left\{P_{W|X}^o(|Q_n \times R_n| \geq \epsilon) \geq \eta\right\} \\
\leq\ & P_X^o\{P_{W|X}^o(|Q_n| \geq \epsilon/M) \geq \eta/2\} + P_X^o\{P_{W|X}^o(|R_n| \geq M) \geq \eta/2\}
\end{aligned}$$

for any $\epsilon, \eta, M > 0$. Then by selecting sufficiently large M, we can show that $P_X^o\left\{P_{W|X}^o(|Q_n \times R_n| \geq \epsilon) \geq \eta\right\} \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$ for any $\epsilon, \eta > 0$. □

A.2. *Two useful inequalities.* Here we give two key technical tools, *Multiplier Inequality* and *Hoffmann-Jorgensen Inequality*, used in proving Lemmas 1 and 2.

Multiplier Inequality (Lemma 4.1 of [37])

Let $W_n = (W_{n1}, \ldots, W_{nn})'$ be non-negative exchangeable random variables on $(\mathcal{W}, \Omega, P_W)$ such that for every n

$$R_n = \int_0^\infty \sqrt{P_W(W_{n1} \geq u)}du < \infty.$$

Let Z_{ni}, $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$, be i.i.d. random elements in $(\mathcal{X}^\infty, \mathcal{A}^\infty, P_X^\infty)$ with values in $\ell^\infty(\mathcal{F}_n)$, and write $\|\cdot\|_n = \sup_{f\in\mathcal{F}_n}|Z_{ni}(f)|$. It is assumed that

Z_{ni}'s are independent of W_n. Then for any n_0 such that $1 \le n_0 < \infty$ and any $n > n_0$, the following inequality holds:

$$\begin{aligned} E^o_{XW}\left\|\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{i=1}^n W_{ni}Z_{ni}\right\|_n &\le n_0 E^o_X\|Z_{n1}\|_n \cdot \frac{E_W(\max_{1\le i\le n} W_{ni})}{\sqrt{n}} \\ &+ R_n \cdot \max_{n_0<i\le n}\left\{E^o_X \frac{1}{\sqrt{i}}\left\|\sum_{j_0+1}^{i} Z_{nj}\right\|_n\right\}. \end{aligned} \tag{A.9}$$

Hoffmann-Jorgensen Inequality for Moments (Prop. A.1.5 in [34])

Let $1 \le p < \infty$ and suppose that $V_1, \ldots, V_n$ are independent stochastic processes with mean zero indexed by an arbitrary index set T. Then there exist constants K_p and $0 < v_p < 1$ such that

$$E^o\left\|\sum_{i=1}^n V_i\right\|^p \le K_p\left\{E^o \max_{1\le k\le n}\|V_k\|^p + [G^{-1}(v_p)]^p\right\}$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the supremum of a stochastic process $\{Y_t, t \in T\}$, i.e. $\sup_t |Y_t|$ and

$$G^{-1}(v) = \inf\left\{u : P^o\left(\|\sum_{i=1}^n V_i\| \le v\right) \ge u\right\}.$$

A.3. *Proof of Lemma 2.* We first write $\mathbb{G}_n^*(\widetilde{m}(\theta,\eta) - \widetilde{m}_0)$ as the sum of $\mathbb{G}_n^*(\widetilde{m}(\theta,\eta) - \widetilde{m}(\theta_0,\eta))$ and $\mathbb{G}_n^*(\widetilde{m}(\theta_0,\eta) - \widetilde{m}_0)$. By the Taylor expansion, the first term becomes $(\theta-\theta_0)'\mathbb{G}_n^*(\partial/\partial\theta)\widetilde{m}(\bar\theta,\eta)$, where $\bar\theta$ is in between θ and θ_0. By the assumption SB2 and Theorem 2.2 in [29], we know the first term is of the order $O^o_{P_W}(\|\theta-\theta_0\|)$ in P^o_X-probability. We next consider the second term. Let

$$\Delta_n = \sup_{\eta\in U_n}\left\{\frac{\|\mathbb{G}_n^*(\widetilde{m}(\theta_0,\eta) - \widetilde{m}_0)\|}{\|\eta-\eta_0\|}\right\}, \tag{A.10}$$

where $U_n = \{\eta : \|\eta - \eta_0\| \le \delta_n\}$ for any $\delta_n \to 0$. Note that we can also write $\Delta_n = \|\mathbb{G}_n^*\|_{\mathcal{S}_n}$, where $\|\mathbb{G}_n^*\|_{\mathcal{S}_n} = \sup_{f\in\mathcal{S}_n}|\mathbb{G}_n^* f|$. By (A.2), to show the below bootstrap equicontinuity condition

$$\mathbb{G}_n^*(\widetilde{m}(\theta_0,\eta)-\widetilde{m}_0)=O^o_{P_W}(\|\eta-\eta_0\|) \ \text{ in } \ P^o_X\text{-Probability}$$

it suffices to show

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} E^o_{XW}\Delta_n<\infty. \tag{A.11}$$

Note that

$$\mathbb{G}_n^*=\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{i=1}^n(W_{ni}-1)\delta_{X_i}=\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{i=1}^n(W_{ni}-1)(\delta_{X_i}-P_X)$$

by the condition that the sum of weights W_{ni}'s equals to n. Let $W_n'=(W_{n1}',\ldots,W_{nn}')$ be exchangeable bootstrap weights generated from $P_{W'}$, an independent copy of P_W. The bootstrap weight conditions $W1$ and $W2$ imply that $E_{W'}W_{ni}'=1$ for $i=1,\ldots,n$. Let

$$m_n(\eta,\eta_0)=\frac{\widetilde{m}(\theta_0,\eta)-\widetilde{m}_0}{\|\eta-\eta_0\|}.$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
E^o_{XW}\Delta_n &= E^o_{XW}\sup_{\eta\in U_n}\|\mathbb{G}_n^*m_n(\eta,\eta_0)\|\\
&= E^o_{XW}\sup_{\eta\in U_n}\left\|\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{i=1}^n(W_{ni}-1)(\delta_{X_i}-P_X)m_n(\eta,\eta_0)\right\|\\
&= E^o_{XW}\sup_{\eta\in U_n}\left\|\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{i=1}^n(W_{ni}-E_{W'}W_{ni}')(\delta_{X_i}-P_X)m_n(\eta,\eta_0)\right\|\\
&\le E^o_{XW}E^o_{W'}\sup_{\eta\in U_n}\left\|\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{i=1}^n(W_{ni}-W_{ni}')(\delta_{X_i}-P_X)m_n(\eta,\eta_0)\right\|.
\end{aligned}$$

We next further bound $E^o_{XW}\Delta_n$ by the following symmetrization argument:

$$\begin{aligned}E^o_{XW}\Delta_n &\leq E^o_{XW}\sup_{\eta\in U_n}\left\|\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{i=1}^n W_{ni}(\delta_{X_i}-P_X)m_n(\eta,\eta_0)\right\|\\ &+ E^o_{XW}E^o_{W'}\sup_{\eta\in U_n}\left\|\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{i=1}^n W'_{ni}(\delta_{X_i}-P_X)m_n(\eta,\eta_0)\right\|\\ &\leq 2E^o_{XW}\sup_{\eta\in U_n}\left\|\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{i=1}^n W_{ni}(\delta_{X_i}-P_X)m_n(\eta,\eta_0)\right\|. \qquad \text{(A.12)}\end{aligned}$$

We next apply the multiplier inequality in the Appendix, i.e. (A.9), with $Z_{ni}=\{(\delta_{X_i}-P_X)m_n(\eta,\eta_0):\eta\in U_n\}$ to (A.12). Let

$$\|Z_{ni}\|_n=\sup_{\eta\in U_n}\|(\delta_{X_i}-P_X)m_n(\eta,\eta_0)\|.$$

We first analyze

$$\begin{aligned}E^o_X\|Z_{n1}\|_n &= E^o_X\sup_{\eta\in U_n}\|(\delta_{X_1}-P_X)m_n(\eta,\eta_0)\|\\ &\leq E^o_X\sup_{\eta\in U_n}\|m_n(\eta,\eta_0)(X_1)\|+E^o_X\sup_{\eta\in U_n}\|E_Xm_n(\eta,\eta_0)\|\\ &\leq 2E^o_XS_n(X_1)\end{aligned}$$

where S_n is the envelop of the class $\mathcal{S}_n$ defined in (7). The first inequality in the above follows the Fatou's Lemma. Note that (21) implies

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}E^o_X\max_{1\leq k\leq n}S_n(X_k) \longrightarrow 0, \qquad \text{(A.13)}$$

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty}E^o_XS_n(X_1) < \infty, \qquad \text{(A.14)}$$

by some analysis, see page 120 of [34]. Then by (A.14), we have $\limsup_n E^o_X\|Z_{n1}\|_n<\infty$.

The bootstrap conditions W3 and W4 together with the Lemma 4.7 in [29] imply that $E_W(\max_{1\leq i\leq n}W_{ni})/\sqrt{n}\to 0$. By the multiplier inequality in the Appendix and the above analysis, to prove (A.11), it suffices to show

$$\max_{n_0<i\leq n}E^o_X\sup_{\eta\in U_n}\left\|\frac{1}{\sqrt{i}}\sum_{j_0+1}^{i}(\delta_{X_j}-P_X)m_n(\eta,\eta_0)\right\|<\infty \qquad \text{(A.15)}$$

as $n \to \infty$. We will apply the Hoffmann-Jorgensen Inequality (with $p = 1$) in the Appendix to show the moment bound of the above truncated empirical processes is finite. First, we establish

$$\begin{aligned} E_X^o \sup_{\eta \in U_n} \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_{ni} \right\| &\leq K_1 \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} E_X^o \max_{1 \leq k \leq n} \|Z_{nk}\|_n + G_n^{-1}(v_1) \right\} \\ &\leq I_1 + I_2, \end{aligned} \tag{A.16}$$

where K_1 and $0 < v_1 < 1$ are constants and

$$G_n(t) = P_X^o \left(n^{-1/2} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n Z_{ni} \right\|_n \leq t \right).$$

Obviously, (A.13) implies that $I_1 \to 0$. We next consider I_2. Note that the assumption S1 implies $\|\mathbb{G}_n\|_{\mathcal{S}_n} = \|n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_{ni}\|_n = O_{P_X}^o(1)$. Hence we can claim that there exists a finite constant M_t such that $\liminf_n G_n(M_t) \geq t$ for every $1 > t > 0$. Thus we know $\limsup_n G_n^{-1}(v_1) \leq M_{v_1} < \infty$ since $0 < v_1 < 1$, and hence (A.16) $< \infty$. Considering the triangular inequality, we have shown (A.15). This completes the whole proof of Lemma 2. □

A.4. *Proof of Lemma 1.* The result (49) is an immediate consequence of Lemma 3.4.2 in [34]. To show (51), we first apply the symmetrization arguments used in the proof of Lemma 2. Thus, for sufficiently small δ, the left hand side of (43) is bounded by

$$2E_{XW}^o \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{ni} Y_{ni} \right\|_{\mathcal{V}_\delta}, \tag{A.17}$$

where W_{ni}'s are the assumed bootstrap weights and

$$Y_{ni} = \{(\delta_{X_i} - P_X)(v(\theta, \eta) - v(\theta, \eta_n)) : d(\eta, \eta_n) \leq \delta, \|\theta - \theta_0\| \leq \delta\}.$$

Next the multiplier inequality (A.9) is employed to further bound (A.17). In view of (A.9), we only need to figure out the upper bound for

$$E_X^o \|Y_{n1}\|_{\mathcal{V}_\delta} \tag{A.18}$$

and

$$\max_{n_0\le i\le n} E_X^o\left\|\frac{1}{\sqrt{i}}\sum_{j_0+1}^{i} Y_{nj}\right\|_{\mathcal{V}_\delta} \tag{A.19}$$

for any $n_0\ge 1$ given the assumptions W3 and W4 on the bootstrap weights. By similar analysis in the proof of Lemma 2, we know

$$E_X^o\|Y_{n1}\|_{\mathcal{V}_\delta}\le 2E_X^o V_n(X_1)$$

where V_n is the envelop function of the class $\mathcal{V}_\delta$ defined in (46). The assumption (50), together with the analysis of assumption SB1, implies that $\limsup_n E_X^o\|Y_{n1}\|_{\mathcal{V}_\delta}<\infty$. Next, the Lemma 3.4.2 in [34] implies that

$$E_X^o\|\mathbb{G}_n\|_{\mathcal{V}_\delta}\le K(\delta,\mathcal{V}_\delta,L_2(P))\left(1+\frac{K(\delta,\mathcal{V}_\delta,L_2(P))}{\delta^2\sqrt{n}}\right).$$

By the triangular inequality, we know that (A.19) has the same upper bound as $E_X^o\|\mathbb{G}_n\|_{\mathcal{V}_\delta}$. This concludes the proof of (51). □

A.5. *Proof of Theorem 4:.* By (38) and the fact that $U(\theta_0,\eta_0)=0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} U(\widetilde\theta,\widehat\eta^*_{\widetilde\theta})-U(\theta_0,\eta_0) &= U(\widetilde\theta,\widehat\eta^*_{\widetilde\theta})-U_n^*(\widetilde\theta,\widehat\eta^*_{\widetilde\theta})+O^o_{P_{XW}}(n^{-1/2})\\ &= -(U_n^*-U_n)(\widetilde\theta,\widehat\eta^*_{\widetilde\theta})-(U_n-U)(\widetilde\theta,\widehat\eta^*_{\widetilde\theta})+O^o_{P_{XW}}(n^{-1/2})\\ &= L_1+L_2+O^o_{P_{XW}}(n^{-1/2}). \qquad\text{(A.20)}\end{aligned}$$

Further, based on the conditions (35) and (37), we apply the Lemma 4.2 in [37] to obtain that $L_1=-(U_n^*-U_n)(\theta_0,\eta_0)+o^o_{P_{XW}}(n^{-1/2}\vee\|\widetilde\theta-\theta_0\|\vee\|\widehat\eta^*_{\widetilde\theta}-\eta_0\|)$. By Lemma 3.3.5 in [34] given (35) and (36), we have $L_2=-(U_n-U)(\theta_0,\eta_0)+o^o_{P_{XW}}(n^{-1/2}\vee\|\widetilde\theta-\theta_0\|\vee\|\widehat\eta^*_{\widetilde\theta}-\eta_0\|)$. By applying CLT and Theorem 2.2 in [29] under the condition (35) to L_1 and L_2, we have

$$U(\widetilde\theta,\widehat\eta^*_{\widetilde\theta})-U(\theta_0,\eta_0)=O^o_{P_{XW}}(n^{-1/2})+o^o_{P_{XW}}(\|\widetilde\theta-\theta_0\|\vee\|\widehat\eta^*_{\widetilde\theta}-\eta_0\|). \tag{A.21}$$

We next apply Taylor expansion to $U(\widetilde{\theta},\widehat{\eta}^*_{\widetilde{\theta}})-U(\theta_0,\eta_0)$:

$$\begin{aligned}
& U(\widetilde{\theta},\widehat{\eta}^*_{\widetilde{\theta}})-U(\theta_0,\eta_0)\\
= \quad & \dot{U}(\widetilde{\theta}-\theta_0,\widehat{\eta}^*_{\widetilde{\theta}}-\eta_0)+o(\|\widetilde{\theta}-\theta_0\|\vee\|\widehat{\eta}^*_{\widetilde{\theta}}-\eta_0\|)\\
= \quad & \dot{U}(\widetilde{\theta}-\theta_0,0)+\dot{U}(0,\widehat{\eta}^*_{\widetilde{\theta}}-\eta_0)+o(\|\widetilde{\theta}-\theta_0\|\vee\|\widehat{\eta}^*_{\widetilde{\theta}}-\eta_0\|)
\end{aligned}$$

by the assumed Fréchet differentiability of U and linearity of $\dot{U}$. Note that U has bounded Fréchet derivative and $\dot{U}(0,\cdot)$ is continuously invertible. Thus, we can conclude that

$$U(\widetilde{\theta},\widehat{\eta}^*_{\widetilde{\theta}})-U(\theta_0,\eta_0)\geq c\|\widehat{\eta}^*_{\widetilde{\theta}}-\eta_0\|+O(\|\widetilde{\theta}-\theta_0\|)+o(\|\widetilde{\theta}-\theta_0\|\vee\|\widehat{\eta}^*_{\widetilde{\theta}}-\eta_0\|)$$

for some $c>0$. Combining the above inequality with (A.21), we can establish the below inequality:

$$\|\widehat{\eta}^*_{\widetilde{\theta}}-\eta_0\|\lesssim O^o_{P_{XW}}(\|\widetilde{\theta}-\theta_0\|\vee n^{-1/2})+o^o_{P_{XW}}(\|\widehat{\eta}^*_{\widetilde{\theta}}-\eta_0\|),$$

which implies (39). □

A.6. *Proof of Theorem 5:.* To prove Theorem 5, we want to show that

$$P^o_{XW}\left(d(\widehat{\eta}^*_{\widetilde{\theta}},\eta_n)\geq 2^{M_n}(\delta_n\vee\|\widetilde{\theta}-\theta_0\|),\widetilde{\theta}\in\Theta,\widehat{\eta}^*_{\widetilde{\theta}}\in\mathcal{H}_n\right)\longrightarrow 0 \tag{A.22}$$

as $n\to\infty$ and $M_n\to\infty$ by (A.2). The basic idea in proving (A.22) is first to partition the whole parameter space into "shell"s and then we can bound the probability of each shell under the conditions (41)-(43).

For now we fix $M=M_n$ and then allow it to increase to infinity. We first define the shell $S_{n,j,M}$ as

$$S_{n,j,M}=\{(\theta,\eta)\in\Theta\times\mathcal{H}_n:2^{j-1}\delta_n<d(\eta,\eta_n)\leq 2^j\delta_n,d(\eta,\eta_n)\geq 2^M\|\theta-\theta_0\|\}$$

with j ranging over the integers and $M > 0$. Obviously, the event $\{\widetilde{\theta} \in \Theta, \widehat{\eta}^*_{\widetilde{\theta}} \in \mathcal{H}_n : d(\widehat{\eta}^*_{\widetilde{\theta}}, \eta_n) \geq 2^M(\delta_n \vee \|\widetilde{\theta} - \theta_0\|)\}$ is contained in the union of the events $\{(\widetilde{\theta}, \widehat{\eta}^*_{\widetilde{\theta}}) \in S_{n,j,M}\}$ for $j \geq M$. Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & P^o_{XW}\left(d(\widehat{\eta}^*_{\widetilde{\theta}}, \eta_n) \geq 2^M(\delta_n \vee \|\widetilde{\theta} - \theta_0\|), \widetilde{\theta} \in \Theta, \widehat{\eta}^*_{\widetilde{\theta}} \in \mathcal{H}_n\right) \\ \leq & \sum_{j \geq M} P^o_{XW}\left((\widetilde{\theta}, \widehat{\eta}^*_{\widetilde{\theta}}) \in S_{n,j,M}\right) \\ \leq & \sum_{j \geq M} P^o_{XW}\left(\sup_{(\theta,\eta) \in S_{n,j,M}} \mathbb{P}^*_n(v(\theta,\eta) - v(\theta,\eta_n)) \geq 0\right). \end{aligned}$$

The second inequality follows from the definition of $\widehat{\eta}^*_{\widetilde{\theta}}$. By the smoothness condition on $v(\theta, \eta)$, i.e. (41), we have the below inequality when $(\theta, \eta) \in S_{j,n,M}$ for $j \geq M$:

$$P_X(v(\theta,\eta) - v(\theta,\eta_n)) \lesssim -d(\eta,\eta_n)^2 + \|\theta - \theta_0\|^2 \lesssim -2^{2j-2}\delta_n^2 \tag{A.23}$$

for sufficiently large M.

Considering (A.23), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & P^o_{XW}\left(d(\widehat{\eta}^*_{\widetilde{\theta}}, \eta_n) \geq 2^M(\delta_n \vee \|\widetilde{\theta} - \theta_0\|), \widetilde{\theta} \in \Theta, \widehat{\eta}^*_{\widetilde{\theta}} \in \mathcal{H}_n\right) \\ \leq & \sum_{j \geq M} P^o_{XW}\left(\sup_{(\theta,\eta) \in S_{n,j,M}} \sqrt{n}(\mathbb{P}^*_n - P_X)(v(\theta,\eta) - v(\theta,\eta_n)) \gtrsim \sqrt{n}2^{2j-2}\delta_n^2\right) \\ \leq & \sum_{j \geq M} P^o_{XW}\left(\sup_{(\theta,\eta) \in S_{n,j,M}} |\mathbb{G}^*_n(v(\theta,\eta) - v(\theta,\eta_n))| \gtrsim \sqrt{n}2^{2j-3}\delta_n^2\right) \\ & + P^o_X\left(\sup_{(\theta,\eta) \in S_{n,j,M}} |\mathbb{G}_n(v(\theta,\eta) - v(\theta,\eta_n))| \gtrsim \sqrt{n}2^{2j-3}\delta_n^2\right) \\ \lesssim & \sum_{j \geq M} \frac{\psi^*_n(2^j\delta_n)}{\sqrt{n}\delta_n^2 2^{2j}} + \frac{\psi_n(2^j\delta_n)}{\sqrt{n}\delta_n^2 2^{2j}} \\ \lesssim & \sum_{j \geq M} 2^{j(\alpha-2)}, \end{aligned}$$

where the third inequality follows from the Markov inequality and (42)-(43). Note that the assumption that $\delta \mapsto \psi_n(\delta)/\delta^\alpha$ ($\delta \mapsto \psi^*_n(\delta)/\delta^\alpha$) is decreasing for some $0 < \alpha < 2$ implies that $\psi_n(c\delta) \leq c^\alpha \psi_n(\delta)$ for every $c > 1$. Combining another assumption on ψ_n and ψ_n^*, i.e. $\psi_n(\delta_n) \leq \sqrt{n}\delta_n^2$ and $\psi_n^*(\delta_n) \leq \sqrt{n}\delta_n^2$, we have proved the last inequality in the above. By allowing $M = M_n \to \infty$, we have completed the proof of (A.22), and thus Theorem 5. $\square$

REFERENCES

[1] Banerjee, M., Mukherjee, D. and Mishra, S. (2009), Semiparametric Binary Regression Models under Shape Constraints with an Application to Indian Schooling Data. *Journal of Econometrics* 149 101-117

[2] Bickel, P. J., Klaassen, C. A. J., Ritov, Y. and Wellner, J. A. (1998) Efficient and Adaptive Estimation for Semiparametric Models. Springer-Verlag, New York.

[3] Chen, X.H. and Pauzo, D. (2008) Efficient Estimation of Semiparametric Conditional Moment Models with Possibly Nonsmooth Residuals, Yale Economics Department Working Paper No.38

[4] Chen, X. (2007).Large Sample Sieve Estimation of Semi-nonparametric Models. *Handbook of Econometrics*, 6B 5550–5632, North-Holland.

[5] Cheng, G. (2008a) Semiparametric Additive Isotonic Regression, *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, 100, 345-362.

[6] Cheng, G. and Kosorok, M. (2008a) Higher Order Semiparametric Frequentist Inference with the Profile Sampler, *Annals of Statistics*, 36, 1786-1818

[7] Cheng, G. and Kosorok, M. (2008b) General Frequentist Properties of the Posterior Profile Distribution, *Annals of Statistics* 36 1819-1853

[8] Delecroix, M., Hristache, M. and Patilea, V. (2006) On Semiparametric M-estimation in Single-index Regression, *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference* 136 730-769

[9] Dixon, J., Kosorok, M. and Lee, B.L. (2005) Functional Inference in Semiparametric Models Using the Piggyback Bootstrap, *Ann. Inst. Statist. Math.* 57, 255-277

[10] Dudley, R.M. (1984) A course on empirical processes. Lecture Notes in Math. 1097 2-142. Springer, Berlin

[11] Grenander, U. (1981). *Abstract Inference* John Wiley, New York.

[12] Gine, E. and Zinn, J. (1990) Bootstrapping General Empirical Functions, *Annals of Probability* 18 851-869

[13] Hall, P. (1992) The Bootstrap and Edgeworth Expansion. Springer Series in Statistics. Springer-Verlag, New York

[14] Hardle, W., Huet, S., Mammen, E. and Sperlich, S. (2004) Bootstrap Inference in Semiparametric Generalized Additive Models, *Econometric Theory* 20 265-300

[15] Henry, M. and Robinson, P.M. (2003) Higher-Order Kernel Semiparametric M-Estimation of Long Memory, *Journal of Econometrics* 114 1-27

[16] Hoffmann-Jorgensen, I. (1984) Stochastic Processes on Polish Spaces. Unpublished Manuscript

[17] Huang, J. (1999) Efficient Estimation of the Partly Linear Cox Model, *Annals of Statistics* 27 1536-1563.

[18] Kosorok, M., Lee, B.L. and Fine, J.P. (2004) Robust Inference for Univariate Proportional Hazards Frailty Regression Models. *Annals of Statistics* 32 1448-1491

[19] Kosorok, M. (2008) Introduction to Empirical Processes and Semiparametric Inference. Springer, New York

[20] Kosorok, M. (2008) Boostrapping the Grenander estimator. Beyond Parametrics in Interdisciplinary Research: Festschrift in Honor of Professor Pranab K. Sen. *IMS Collectiions* 1 282-292.

[21] Lee, B.L., Kosorok, M.R. and Fine, J.P. (2005) The profile sampler, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 100 960-969

[22] Lin, D. Y., Fleming, T. R. and Wei, L. J. (1994) Confidence bands for survival curves under the proportional hazards model, *Biometrika* 81 73-81

[23] Ma, S. and Kosorok, M. (2005a) Robust Semiparametric M-estimation and the Weighted Bootstrap, *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* 96 190-217

[24] Ma, S. and Kosorok, M. (2005b) Penalized Log-likelihood Estimation for Partly Linear Transformation Models with Current Status Data, *Annals of Statistics* 33 2256-2290

[25] Morton-Jones, T., Diggle, P., Parker, L., Dickinson, H.O. and Binks, K. (2000) Additive Isotonic Regression Models in Epidemiology, *Statistics in Medicine* 19 849-859.

[26] Murphy, S.A. and van der Vaart, A.W. (1997) Semiparametric Likelihood Ratio In-

ference, *Annals of Statistics* 4 1471-1509

[27] Murphy, S.A. and van der Vaart, A.W. (1999) Observed Information in Semiparametric Models, *Bernoulli* 5 381-412

[28] Murphy, S.A. and van der Vaart, A.W. (2000) On Profile Likelihood, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 95 1461-1474

[29] Praestgaard, J. and Wellner, J. (1993) Exchangeably Weighted Bootstraps of the General Empirical Process, *Annals of Statistics* 21 2053-2086

[30] Roeder, K., Carroll, R. J., and Lindsay, B. G. (1996) A Semiparametric Mixture Approach to Case-Control Studies with Errors in Covariables, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 91 722-732

[31] Sen, B., Banerjee, M. and Woodroofe, M. B. (2009) Inconsistency of bootstrap: the Grenander estimator. *Annals of Statistics* Invited Revision.

[32] Shao, J. and Tu, D. (1996) The Jackknife and Bootstrap, Springer, New York

[33] Strawderman, R. (2006) A Regression Model for Dependent Gap Times, *The International Journal of Biostatistics* 2 1

[34] van der Vaart, A. W., and Wellner, J. A. (1996) Weak Convergence and Empirical Processes: With Applications to Statistics. Springer, New York

[35] van der Vaart, A.W. (1998) Asymptotic Statistics, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge

[36] van de Geer, S. (2000) Empirical Processes in M-estimation, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge

[37] Wellner, J.A. and Zhan, Y. (1996) Bootstrapping Z-estimators. Technical report 308, University of Washington

[38] Wellner, J.A. and Zhang, Y. (2007) Two Likelihood-Based Semiparametric Estimation Methods for Panel Count Data with Covariates. *Annals of Statistics* 35 2106-2142

[39] Wellner, J.A., Zhang, Y. and Liu, H. (2002) Two Semiparametric Estimation Methods for Panel Count Data. Unpublished Manuscript.

[40] Wouk, A. (1979). A Course of Applied Functional Analysis. Wiley, New York.

[41] Zeng, D.L. and Lin, D.Y. (2007) Maximum Likelihood Estimation in Semiparametric Models with Censored Data (with discussion), *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society B* 69 507-564

[42] Zhang, C.M. and Yu, T. (2008) Semiparametric Detection of Significant Activation for Brain FMRI, *Annals of Statistics* 36 1693-1725

Guang Cheng
Department of Statistics
Purdue University
West Lafayette, IN 47907-2066
Email: chengg@purdue.edu

Jianhua Z. Huang
Department of Statistics
Texas A&M University
College Station, TX 77843-3143
Email: jianhua@stat.tamu.edu